

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAR 4 1952

desk
CONTENTSPERIODICAL
READING ROOM

PAGE

WOOD, GORDON E.—A Note on the Manuscript Source of the Alliterative "Destruction of Troy."	145
SPITZER, LEO.—Emendations Proposed to "De Amico ad Amicum" and "Responcia."	150
LEVY, RAPHAEL.—Les Dérivés médiévaux du mot "chaux."	156
SCHAFER, AARON.—Madame Victor Hugo in the Poetry of Auguste Vacquerie.	160
PITCHFORD, LOIS W.—The Curtal Sonnets of Gerard Manley Hopkins.	165
TYLER, RICHARD W.—Suggested Dates for More of Lope de Vega's "Comedias."	170
DALE, GEORGE IRVING.—The Ladies of Cristóbal de Castillejo's Lyrics.	173
MORRISSETTE, BRUCE A.—Vance Thompson's Plagiarism of Teodor de Wyzewa's Articles on Mallarmé.	175
BITOU, SPIRE.—An Eighteenth-Century Abridgment of La Calprenède's "Faramond."	178
MATE, HUBERT E.—The Treatment of "Saudade da pátria" by Certain Brazilian Romantic Poets.	181
MAGOUN, F. P., JR.—Chaucer's Sir Gawain and the Offr. "Roman de la Rose."	183
STEVENS, LINTON C.—Montaigne's Misinterpretation of a Greek Citation.	185
COHEN, HENNIG.—An Early American Example of French Poetry.	187
FANG, ACHILLES.—A Note on Pound's "Papyrus."	188

REVIEWS:—

HANS M. WOLFF, Goethes Weg zur Humanität. [Stuart Atkins.]	190
ERNEST TONNELAT, L'œuvre poétique et la pensée religieuse de Hölderlin. [Werner Verdriels.]	192
W. ROLOFF, E. MIX and M. NICOLAI, German Literature in British Maga- zines, 1750-1860. [R. P. Rosenberg.]	194
JACQUES SCHERER, La Dramaturgie classique en France. [H. C. Len- castor.]	196
GEOFFROY ATKINSON, Les Idées de Balzac d'après la Comédie humaine. [Carlos Lynes, Jr.]	198
GERMAINE BRÉE, Du temps perdu au temps retrouvé. Introduction à l'œuvre de Marcel Proust. [Carlos Lynes, Jr.]	201
GRAHAM HOUGH, The Last Romantics. [E. K. Brown.]	203
JOSEPH BEAVER, Walt Whitman—Poet of Science. [Alice L. Cooks.]	204
MARGARET DENNY and W. H. GILMAN (eds.), The American Writer and the European Tradition. [Christof Wegelin.]	206
JONAS DE FRANCIS, Nationalism and Language Reform in China. [Hos- sein Veith.]	208
BYRON SEYBOLD, Thoreau: The Quest and the Classics. [Raymond Adams.]	209
ALAN H. WARREN, JR., English Poetic Theory, 1825-1865. [Graham Hough.]	211

BRIEF MENTION: DONALD SMALLEY (ed.), Browning's Essay on Chatter- ton; GRACE PAULINE IHESU, Heroines in French Drama of the Romantic Period, 1828-1848; DAVID DACHES, Willis Guther: A Critical Introduction.	VII
--	-----

CORRESPONDENCE: Leming's Rumored Journey to Vienna in 1749; The Malous Society	214
---	-----

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with Intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
KEMP MALONE
ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,
R. B. Roulston, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the Current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JNGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

New 1951 Edition FRENCH LANGUAGE SERIES

by Travis

State Adopted in
Louisiana, Mississippi
Tennessee, Utah, Nevada

Cours Elémentaire de Français . . . \$1.00
Cours Moyen de Français—Part 1 . . . 2.25
Cours Moyen de Français—Part 2 . . . 1.50

This series is widely used, not only in the United States, but throughout Canada and England. Each book contains ample reading material as well as a great variety of exercises for developing conversational French and grammar. Phonograph records with models of the vowel sounds, consonants, and correct pronunciation of the French, including a rendition in French of some of the stories and the poems, are available.

THE ECCLESIA LATIN READER—

Sisters of St. Joseph \$1.00

GREEK VERB BLANK—Vaughn 40

A convenient time-saving device for mastering the difficult Greek verbs.

TRANSLATIONS

We can supply English editions of the best-known classical and modern foreign-language texts of all publishers if they are available.

Write for free catalog MN.

NOBLE & NOBLE, Publishers, Inc.
67 Irving Place New York 3, N. Y.

E. M. W. Tillyard

AUTHOR OF

Studies in Milton

The Elizabethan World Picture

The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt

Now Writes

THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE:

FACT OR FICTION?

A noted English scholar examines the Medieval and Renaissance traditions in three widely separated areas of literature: the lyric, the epic, and literary criticism. Introduction by Don Cameron Allen. \$3.00

The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Md.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103
Act of Congress of July 16, 1924.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXVII

MARCH, 1952

Number 3

A NOTE ON THE MANUSCRIPT SOURCE OF THE ALLITERATIVE *DESTRUCTION OF TROY*

In the discussions of the Middle English alliterative poem, *De Destruction of Troy* (ca. 1400), little attention has been given to a hypothesis that the extant manuscript of the poem was largely copied from dictation. To the editors of the *Destruction*, indeed, this hypothesis seemed to account for the differences between the two scribal hands and for the eccentric spellings found throughout the manuscript; in commenting on the latter point one of them wrote:

The evident mistakes, or say the curious combinations of letters employed in the spelling of the proper names especially . . . suggested to him [Mr. Donaldson, the other editor] . . . that the carefully executed portions were copied at leisure from perhaps the original, while the rest was less carefully taken down from dictation by the copyist, who seemingly did not know the words he wrote down, and spelt from the sound.¹

The reader may judge for himself the value and the effect of that hypothesis particularly in its relation to studies of the poet-translator's diction and dialect; my concern will be to show the similarities between the curious spellings of proper names in the *Destruction* and those in one manuscript of Guido della Colonna's *Historia Destructionis Troiae* as edited by Griffin.² In addition to the

¹ G. A. Panton and D. Donaldson (edd.), *The Gest Hystoriale of the Destruction of Troy* (EETS, 39 and 56; London, 1869, 1874), pp. vii-viii. The present writer has compared the EETS text with a photocopy of the manuscript of *Destruction* and has found no differences significant for this study.

² N. E. Griffin (ed.), *Guido de Columnis: Historia Destructionis Troiae* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

evidence of significant proper names, I shall include where possible the evidence of distinctive phrases in order to determine the Latin source which the English translator used.

Griffin's edition of Guido is a composite text: its basis is a manuscript written forty-seven years after the original; but this manuscript has been corrected from the readings of four others, the latest of which was written sixty-six years after the original. In addition the editor has used evidence from four other manuscripts, two early printed editions, Benoît de Sainte-Maure, Dares Phrygius, Dictys Cretensis, and three translations; all variant readings appear in the footnotes.³ My conclusions depend upon these variant readings; for, having collated the text of the *Destruction* with that of the *Historia*, I am convinced that the English translator used no other source, that he followed the *Historia* closely, and that he translated his poem from a manuscript which had many traits in common with a manuscript used in Griffin's edition. My intention, however, is not to show that the English translator had access to one of the manuscripts now printed; it is rather to show the family resemblances between one manuscript of Guido and the extant printed *Destruction*. The student of late Middle English verse translation may then cautiously use this information to reconstruct the source which the translator had at hand.

A comparison of the translation with the *Historia* will show that certain readings are close to those of Griffin's manuscript A (British Museum, Additional 36671). The name *Arundyna*, for example, seems closer to *Arundiam* of A than it does to *Arisban*, *Ausidam*, *Arisbam*, or *Arisdam* of other manuscripts;⁴ the significance of its resemblance to *Armidiem* of manuscript H (British Museum, Harley 4123) will be discussed later in this paper. Other names similar to those found in manuscript A are *Baunus* (5457), *Chethes* (158), *Philmen* (13443), *Sapmon* (4124), *Saracbla* (4672), and *Vazor* (4384).⁵ *Pendragon* deserves special comment. From Griffin we conclude that the form originally was *Pandarus*.⁶

³ *Ibid.*, pp. xi-xv.

⁴ *Destruction*, 12195; *Historia*, p. 238, n. 12.

⁵ *Historia*: Remus text, Bannus A, p. 116, n. 19; Oetes text, Chetes A, p. 14, n. 16; Philistenes text, Phylimenis A, p. 263, n. 8; Capenor text, Sapenor A, p. 90, n. 9; Sarronabo text, Saratabola A, p. 101, n. 12; Naxos text, Vaxos A, p. 95, n. 29.

⁶ *Destruction*, 5436; *Historia*, p. 115, n. 23.

By misreading and miscopying it became *Pandratatus*, the form in the *A* manuscript; the next step was the misreading of *t* as *c*, a common mistake, with the result that the form *Pandracus* or *Pendracus* appeared. This in turn was literally translated: *dracus* became *dragon* and, perhaps from an accidental recollection of Uther Pendragon, a new name, *Pendragon*, appeared among those who fought at Troy. To the evidence of these names we may add that of the three lions painted on Hector's shield in the *Destruction* and in *A*; the other manuscripts report one lion.⁷ Further study of these documents shows that in certain places the names which are similar in *Destruction* and *A* are also in manuscript *H*; those common to all three but generally not to the readings of other manuscripts are *Anglas* (7026), *Henex* (6361), *Hupon* (7473), *Synabor* (6087), *Tricerda* (1558), and *Delus . . . Or Belus* (4332-33).⁸ To these names we may add the expression *shelde of gold* since *A* and *H* have *aureus* where all but one of the other manuscripts have *azureus*.⁹

According to Griffin manuscripts *A* and *H* hold closely together though not so closely as to show that either was copied from the other.¹⁰ It should be clear, then, that these two manuscripts and the *Destruction* have many features in common and that each of them comes from the same ancestor, however remote. From a further study of the evidence we learn that the translation records forms which may have been those of the original manuscript of the *Historia*. An examination of Griffin's notes will show that *Hupon* and *aureus*, given above, appear in one additional document at that point though not in the same document in either instance; no other examples previously cited illustrate this occurrence. Of the two *aureus* is the reading found additionally in the Strassburg printed edition of 1486; *Hupon* of the translation resembles *Hapon* of manuscript *P*² (Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds latin 5695), a most significant manuscript because of the excellence of its readings. In Griffin's opinion *P*² is independent of *AH* and shows on the

⁷ *Destruction*, 6291; *Historia*, p. 131, n. 22.

⁸ *Historia*: Douglas text, Anglas *AH*, p. 144, n. 21; Henes text, Henex *AH*, p. 132, n. 35; Ampon text, Hupon *AH*, p. 153, n. 13; Cycinalor text, Sinabor *AH*, p. 127, n. 20; Tymbreia text, Tricerbra, p. 47, n. 10; iste Bellus rex text, Delus vel Belus *AH*, p. 94, n. 21.

⁹ *Destruction*, 6144; *Historia*, p. 128, n. 23.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. xii.

whole better readings than does the earliest manuscript (P^1) which he chose as the basis of his text.¹¹ By *better readings* Griffin apparently meant that P^2 came nearer than the other manuscripts to what Guido originally wrote. Three more names illustrate the similarity between the *Destruction* and manuscript P^2 . Of these *Bachian* (4385) and *Toax* (4085) are found in similar form in *AH*¹² while *Symon* (11887) resembles either the form in *A* or that in *HP*² and the earliest manuscript (P^1).¹³ From these examples it is evident that the translator's source retained some readings found in very early manuscripts of the *Historia*, perhaps the original.

At times the *Destruction* uses readings which are not found in the printed Latin manuscripts and which apparently are those of the original manuscript of the *Historia*. Examples of these readings are the names *Elyda* (4117), *Pafflegon* (5489), and *Serces* (6224), for these seem closer to the names in Benoît de Sainte Maure's *Roman de Troie* than they do to those of the Latin manuscripts.¹⁴ More striking, however, is a phrase relating to Phion's splendid chariot: In the Latin manuscripts this phrase is *Hic currus a duobus fortibus et pugnacibus militibus constipatus erat*. At this point we find in the English translation *Two dromoudarys drowe hit*, an impossible translation of the Latin but one to be explained by Benoît's statement, *Dui dromadaire le traeient*.¹⁵ Doubtless the dromedaries appeared in Guido's translation of the *Roman de Troie* and in the first copies of that translation; later copyists, including those who formed the tradition represented by the manuscripts in Griffin's text, omitted the dromedaries and substituted for them the two brave and warlike knights. Of this later development we have no record in *Destruction*.

From the evidence of names and phrases we may conclude that the manuscript source of *Destruction* retained details of a manuscript very close to Guido's original translation. Here I must add

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. xii-xiii.

¹² *Historia*: *Bacum text*, *Bachiam AHP*², p. 95, n. 30; *Thoas text*, *Thoax AHP*², p. 88, n. 31.

¹³ *Historia*: *Sinon*, *Synonem text*, *Symon*, *Simon A*, *Symonem P*¹*P*², *Symon HP*¹*P*², p. 232, n. 2 and p. 233, n. 3.

¹⁴ *Historia*: *Hesida text*, *Elide B*, p. 89, n. 34; *Paffagonie text*, *Paflagoine B*, p. 117, n. 15; *Xerxes text*, *Serse B*, p. 130, n. 12.

¹⁵ *Destruction*, 6207; *Historia*, p. 120, n. 30.

several cautions lest I be misunderstood. First, my investigation of the printed *Destruction* and of the photocopy does not account for all the proper names which appear in the poem; for example, in the long lists of warriors who fought at Troy I have found confusion and misreading which defies interpretation. Such confusion, however, is to be expected in manuscript transmission and in translation. Second, the printed names are deceptive, for there is often more apparent similarity between them in print than in manuscript. Knowing the great possibility of misreading some medieval hands, I have sought to include only those examples about which there could be little dispute; if I have erred in particular instances, I feel that the cumulative weight of evidence should counteract individual mistakes. Third, it seems altogether possible for a scribe to misread a word and quite by accident to produce a spelling which resembles that in another and remote manuscript tradition; I doubt that this sort of accident occurs frequently enough to invalidate the evidence here presented. And finally, a comparison of the translation with the readings of Griffin's text shows that a name found to be that of *A* in one line is that of *H* or that of another manuscript when the same name appears a few lines later; my collation, however, has led me to believe that *A* readings, either by themselves or in combination with similar readings in other manuscripts, occur with greater frequency than do those from any other single manuscript.

We may conclude that the curious combinations of the letters in the spelling of proper names, supported by some phrasal evidence, show that the translator saw readings in his source which resemble those in certain known manuscripts of Guido's *Historia*; and that, rather than supporting a hypothesis of speedy and unintelligent copying, they show the care which the scribes of the extant manuscript used in copying them—whether dictated or not we cannot say. We may further conclude that the English translator's manuscript source resembled manuscript *A* in many significant details; and also that this source retained traits common to the ancestor of manuscripts *A* and *H* but distinguished from the latter by the preservation of certain very ancient traits peculiar to Guido's own manuscript and its immediate copies. From my study of the *Destruction* and the printed text of the *Historia*, I have evolved a rough formula for determining what words may have appeared in the translator's

source: If there is a choice of readings, the translator possibly saw the variant which is that of manuscript *A* unless contradicted by the wording of *Destruction*; this possibility is strengthened if the same variant is in *H* and even more so if it is in *H* and *P*² as well as in *A*. Beyond this we cannot go with present evidence in reconstructing the manuscript source of *De Destruction of Troy*.¹⁶

GORDON R. WOOD

University of Chattanooga

EMENDATIONS PROPOSED TO *DE AMICO AD AMICAM* AND *RESPONCIO*

In Chambers' and Sidgwick's "Early English Lyrics," p. 15 seq., we find two macaronic poems drawn from the *Camb. Gg. iv. 27* manuscript (for abridged versions see *The Oxford Book of English Poetry*, 2nd edition). In the two poems *De amico ad amicam* and *Responcio* (which I shall call I and II in the following discussion) French, English and Latin lines alternate, the French particularly offering a number of ambiguous or unexplained forms the proper interpretation of which can hardly be guessed from the terse comments of the editors.

I. opens with the stanza:

A celuy que pluys eyme en mounde
Of alle tho that I have founde
 Carissima,
Saluz od treyé amour,
With grace and joye alle honoure,
 Dulcissima.

Chambers and Sidgwick explain *treyé* in l. 3 as Fr. *trié* 'proven' without defining *od* or giving the meaning of the passage as a whole. It is obvious that the first stanza of I must, in accordance with the first of II, contain greetings: *A celuy que plus eyme en mounde*

¹⁶ The writer is indebted to the Committee on Photographic Reproductions, Modern Language Association of America, for the photocopy of *De Destruction of Troy* (Hunterian Ms. v. 2. 8) and to the Carnegie Foundation Research Fund for a grant which facilitated the preparation of this article.

... *salutz* corresponds to *A soun treschere et special*. . . . *Que soy ou sal[u]tz* in II. Since in the second case the *que* introduces a wish (for the good health of the addressee) the verb in the first must also contain a desiderative (a subjunctive without *que*, cf. below my remark about II, l. 43)—and this condition is filled by an emendation of *od treyé* into *ottreye*, i. e. the subjunctive of the OF verb *otroier*, *otreyer*, *ot(t)rier* (< Lat. **auctoricare*) 'to grant' (mod. Fr. *octroyer*): 'To the one whom I love most in the world . . . may love grant (bring) greetings!' The *d* before *t* is obviously an inverse spelling for *t*.

In Stanza 21:

Et moun amour doné vous ay,
And also thine owene night and day
In cisto

The Latin phrase is unexplained. A masc. or neuter **cistus* (-um) of which *cisto* should be the ablative does not exist; we have only the Lat. feminine *cista* (cf. the diminutives *cistula*, *cistella*), derived from Gr. *κίστη* fem.; in Romance too it is the *cista* form that we find first represented (> It. *cesta*; the masc. *cesto* is a secondary, a Romance development) just as German shows only *Kiste* fem. It would be daring to assume a Vulgar Latin **cistus* reconstructed on the basis of Romance forms such as It. *cesto* in the poem of a clerical writer who must have prided himself on his knowledge of correct Latin (which with him includes ecclesiastical Latin, cf. *tristando* [II, 27] and *zelando* [II, 30], but never Vulgar Latin). Moreover, if we read *in cisto* a verb is missing which should govern *thine owene* [sc. love]. Thus I propose to read *incisto* (in one word), 1. pers. pres. of a verb **incistare* 'to enshrine,' a nonce-word which the author may well have coined: 'I have given you my love, and thine, I preserve, night and day, as in a shrine.' It may be noted that, in contrast to the French lines which flow easily from and into the English,¹ the short Latin lines often produce a climactic

¹ This is not to say that the French lines do not distinguish themselves from the English. One may note, f. ex., 1) the marked predilection for bimembral, tautological phrases (the rhetorical device of *amplificatio*, well-known in OF poetry): I, 6 *pleasant et beele*, 13 *ma tresduce et tresamé*, 16 *permanent et leal*, 19 *dolent et tryst*, 43 (*douce, bele*) *pleasant et chere*, 49 *joyous et seyn*, 55 *tresbele et tresamé*; II, 1 *treschere et special*, 4 *sal[u]tz et gré*; by contrast in the E. part emotional emphasis is rather

effect, characteristic of Latin *brevitas: suspiro, memento, tenete, venire, converto, sepulta, amate, notate*, read in their particular context, render intense feeling as it were in condensation, so that the reader must stop to take in the impact of feeling that is latent in the one short Latin word. Our **incisto* would be in harmony with this observation.

In l. 20: *Mort hatt; tret sun espeye* the form *hatt* is inexplicable. Professor Brandin's emendation's: *ha!* (the interjection) is untenable ('Death, ha!, shoots quickly his dart'?). I should propose tentatively *hatty* = OF *hasti(f)*, *hastiu* 'hasty' (the 3 must represent *y* as in ME *if* = *yif* 'if,' -*tt*- from -*xt*-, -*st*-, and the fem. form is replaced by the masc., see below²): 'hasty Death.'

expressed by trimembral phrases which are thereby saved from being stereotyped (I 5 *with grace and joye and all honour*, II 2 *fer and ner and overal*, 5 *with mouth, word and herte free*). 2) There is in the French part an overwhelming number of formulae of courtesy of the *jeo vous pry* (*par charité*) type (I, 28, 64, 67; II, 7, 25, 40, 52) in contrast to only one English case of *I preye you for your curteisie* II, 50. These two traits of style combine to give a picture of French as the language of conventional and formularized courtly love, as what Lessing would call "der Kanzleistil der Liebe" (cf. such authentic chancery terms, appropriate in a formal letter, as II, 10 *sertefyés a vous jeo fay*),—while English is the language of love, the language of the heart. This general impression of sincerity in the English lines is borne out by the fact that 3) all the similes—all of them no mere stock devices—are reserved for the English part: I 41 [my love] *brenneth hot as doth the fyr*, II 23 *I were as light as the flour*, 26 *I falle so doth the lef on the tree*. 4) One may compare also the sincerity of tone of certain E. lines with the formality of the French; I 16/7: *Soyez permanent et leal*—Love me so that I it fele; 33/4 *Vous avez moy empresoné*—Allas, thine love well me sle; 58/9 *De cestis portes entendement*—And in youre herte (!) taketh extent; 61/2 *A vos jeo tut doné*—Mine herte (!) is full of love to thee; 70/1 *And turne thy herte (!) me toward*—O a Dieu que vous gard!, II 40/1 *De moy, jeo pry, avez peté*—Turneth your herte (!) and loveth me (*coeur* appears only once, I, 40, in the Fr. part).

We see, then, that our macaronic poems have been conceived, consciously and with some sophistication, on three separate linguistic levels every one of which has its specific climate: The English—that of genuine feeling, the French—of conventional courtesy, the Latin—of epigrammatic terseness. The order in which the three climates appear is not arbitrary; the courtly French must needs 'open the conversation,' to be followed by the mother tongue with its note of corroborative sincerity, the 'period' ending with the pointed Latin.

² Cf. also *jolyf*, said of the lady, in the ME poem "Blow, northerne wynd."

L. 26 *Et par ceo jeo vos treser*. Chambers and Sidgwick say: "Ms. 'creser.' *tres* intensifies *servir*." Their interpretation seems to be: **jeo vous tres ser*[f] 'I serve you well.' But OF *tres* is never found as a verbal prefix unless the verbs mean 'to go through, or to go too far, with an activity (*trespercier*, *trespasser*); it is only found with adjectives and participles (cf. in our texts *tresduce*, *tresamé*, *tresbele*); a **tresservir* exists as little as **tresamer*. Moreover, the interpretation of our editors fails to provide any link with the following line ('Love me well withouten daunger'). As for the reading of *treser*, I propose simply *tres*[ch]*er*[e] 'my beloved' (vocative), with disregard of the final -e as in *tresamé* (l. 14) and *cler* (l. 46) (cf. conversely II, 1 *treschere* used as masc.): in our texts the distinction between masc. and fem. is obliterated³ owing to the disappearance in pronunciation of the final -e. One may suppose that an Anglonorman form **trescere* [= Fr. *très-chère*] was written *tressere* (cf. the Latin form *crescendo* I, 42, and, also, the inverse spelling *Responcio*) and that the -ss- was then simplified. My emendation implies, of course, that a verb is missing in the line ('I . . . you, most beloved'), the verb most easily supplied being 'beg, entreat': could the scribe have omitted e. g. *pry*? The fact is that in II, 17 we find precisely this lacuna—which the editors have filled. Thus I would read our line: *Et par ceo je vous* [*pry*], *tres-chier*.

L. 31 *Et de vous enpense tut dyz*. From the silence of the editors we may conclude that they interpret: 'I think of you all day(s).' But this explanation is impossible because OF *empenser* is either used transitively (*empenser une chose*) or as a past participle in the meaning 'pensive, full of thoughts.' I suggest that *empense* be stressed on the last syllable and that *suy* be added: *et de vous empensé* [*suy*] *tut dyz*, with the participle in the meaning '(I am) full of thoughts (of you).'

The lines 62/3:

Mine herte is full of love to thee
Presento

need explanation. I suppose that we have to do with an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction: *mine herte is full of love to thee* + *min herte full of*

³ This levelling of the genders extends to the tonic demonstrative: I, 1 *celuy* instead of the correct fem. *celi*.

love to thee *presento* ('I present to you my heart full of love'). Somehow similar is the telescoping in I. 71 of two current OF forms of greeting: *a Dieu [soyez] + (que) Dieu vos gard* into *a Dieu que vos gard*.

In the first stanza of II:

A soun treschere et special,
Fer and ner and overal
 In mundo,
Que soy ou saltz et gré,
With mouth, word and herte free
 Jocundo

the form *saltz* in l. 4 has been corrected by the editors into *salutz*, the *ou*, however, remaining unexplained. To interpret *ou* as the contracted form of *en + le* would mean that we have to do with a—quite unusual—expression **que soy en le salut* (with article). It seems to me clear that the Anglonorman poet (or the scribe) has mistaken the form *ou* as a synonym of the simple preposition *en* since he has found such OF alternations as *en mounde* (extant in our texts, I, 1), *en siecle* and *ou monde, ou siecle*. The delicate OF mechanism: *en* without article, *ou* = *en* with article, was not understood by him. Indeed in I, 46 we find *claunchant ou la clere note* 'sounding in the (its) clear tone' where *ou* is followed by a feminine article and can only be interpreted as the simple equivalent of the preposition *en*. We shall be justified then in understanding our line *que soy ou saltz et gré* = *que soit en salut et gré*. The whole stanza would have to be interpreted thus: 'To her dear and special friend . . . [sc. should this letter go]. May he be in health [*salut* properly = 'spiritual health, state of salvation,' of which the meaning 'greeting,' I, 4, is a derivative] and in a receptive mood [*gré* 'agreement'], with . . . heart free and cheerful' [*jocundo* being constructed as if the whole phrase were in Latin: *pectore libero et jucundo*']. I must admit, however, that an example for the coupling of *salut* and *gré* is not known to me from other OF

'A similar case is I, 60: 'De cestis portes entendement, / And in your herte taketh entent / *Honorem*'—the Latin form is justified only in a context such as *cura (honorem)*, not after *portes entendement, taketh intent*. Again in I, 26: 'I clepe to thee *Causantem*' (not *causanti*) the Latin accusative refers probably to an *accuso te*. . . This habit testifies again (cf. note 1) to the poet's conception of the independence of the Latin text.

sources. The nominative *-s* in *salutz* after preposition, in turn, must not shock us (cf. I, 31 *tut dyz*) since the OF two-case declension system must have broken down in the Anglonorman dialect of our period.

Stanza 3 is printed thus:

Quant a vous venu serray
I you swere be this day
15 *Pro certo.*
Mes jeo fuyss en maladye,
Yif ye me love sikerlie
 Converto.

In order to give meaning to the passage we must put ll. 14-5 in parenthesis and add a comma after 17: 'When I shall have come to you (I swear it by this day with all certainty), I would become healthy again (*converto*) if I were sore afflicted, provided only you love me truly.'

The *mes* (*mais*) + subjunctive might be analogous to, although not quite identical with, the *mais* (*que*) + subj. treated by Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.* III, 96 (e. g. in the Roland: *Saveir i at, mais qu'il seit entendud*) and usually translated 'if only, provided that.' In our passage it is rather *yif* that has this meaning, but we assume that in the original meaning of *mais* (*que*) 'only if' the idea of the 'proviso' has disappeared and the simply hypothetical meaning 'if' remained.⁵

L. 43 *A cestys ay maunde de vos ore*. No explanation is given. It should be said that *maundé* (with accent) is a noun (< Lat. *mandatum* 'missive') as in l. 51 *cestes maundes*, that *ay* is the subjunctive *aie* (a desiderative without *que*) and that *a cestys* = mod. Fr. *à ceci* (cf. I, 57 *de cestis* = *de ceci*, the *-y-*, *-i-* being as spurious as the *-e-* in *cestes maundés* = *cest mandé*, l. 52): 'To this [my letter] may I have (receive) by now an answer from you'—a thought which is repeated in l. 46: *Remaundé* (= *remaundez* 'mandez de votre côté) *votre volonté*.

LEO SPITZER

⁵ Another possibility of explanation is to give to *mes* the meaning 'the most,' and to translate: 'However much I should be sick. . . .'

LES DÉRIVÉS MÉDIÉVAUX DU MOT *CHAUX*

Jusqu'ici on croyait que *chaux* a débuté sous la forme *chauz* dans le *Roman de Rou*, que Wace a écrit vers 1169. Or le mot *chalz* se trouve dans le commentaire talmudique que Raschi a composé dans la deuxième moitié du onzième siècle.¹ Quoique le substantif *calcination* soit relevé dans l'*Alchimiste* qui est souvent attribué à Jean de Meun, on croyait sur la foi de Godefroy, Compl. VIII p. 410b et IX p. 30c, que le verbe dont il dérive, *calciner*, n'a fait son apparition qu'en 1377 dans la *Pratique* de maistre Bernard de Gordon. De même ce mot a dû exister antérieurement: *chaciner* "enduire de chaux" date de 1240 en judéo-français.²

Dauzat a suivi le Dictionnaire Général en datant *chauler* "amender un terrain avec de la chaux" à partir de 1753 dans l'*Encyclopédie*.³ Il aurait dû suivre le dictionnaire de Bloch, qui le date de 1372 dans la *Propriété des choses* traduite par Corbichon.⁴ Du Cange, s. v. *calciator*, a enregistré *cauchier* "paver" dans un compte qui date de l'an 1526. Godefroy, II pages 3 et 84-94, VI p. 661 et Compl. IX p. 320, cite trois verbes en vieux français — *chaucier* "traverser une chaussée" (vers 1174), *descauchier* "dépaver" (en 1434), *recauchier* "réparer" (en 1425) — à côté de trois adjectifs et six noms: *cauchois* "bâti avec de la chaux" (au douzième siècle), *chauceis* "fait avec de la chaux" (vers 1190), *chaucin* "de chaux" (au douzième siècle); *cauchin* "terrain où

¹ A. Darmesteter-D. S. Blondheim, *Bibl. Ecole hautes études*, CCLIV (1929), glose 184. Cette glose est précédée d'un astérisque pour indiquer que son authenticité est incertaine. Cependant elle est assez répandue en judéo-français. Elle se retrouve dans des imprimés et dans des manuscrits que je vais citer par leurs sigles convenus: A, Isaïe XXXIII 12; E folio 162v, au même verset; FIII, Job XXXIII 11; G au lemme hébreu *sid*; S, Deut. XXVII 2; ZI page 85.

² M. Lambert-L. Brandin, *Glossaire hébreu-français du treizième siècle* (Paris, 1905), au verset Deut. XXVII 2.

³ A. Dauzat, *Le Fran. Mod.*, IX (1941), pp. 41-45, réimprimé dans ses *Etudes de linguistique française* (Paris, 1945), pp. 236-241. La date de 1753 est répétée par E. Gamillscheg, *Etym. Wörterbuch franz. Sprache* (Heidelberg, 1928), s. v. *chauler*.

⁴ Dans la deuxième édition du dictionnaire refondue par W. von Wartburg, le composé *échauler* est attesté en 1700 et le dérivé *chaulage* en 1764.

l'on trouve de la chaux" (en 1337), *chassine* "chaux" (en 1414), *chalcine* "terrain qui renferme de la chaux" (en 1259), *chaucheiz* "four à chaux" (en 1340), *chauchiere* "four à chaux" (en 1406), *chauceur* "celui qui est chargé de l'entretien des chaussées, paveur" (en 1318). Barbier⁵ a reculé du dix-huitième au quatorzième siècle le début de trois mots modernes avec le préfixe *en*: *enchaux* (en 1392), *enchausser* (en 1367), *enchaussener* (en 1324). Un autre verbe se trouve dans une ordonnance de 1407 où il s'agit de "préparer (les peaux) à la chaux"; la mauvaise leçon *enchaussuiner* intercalée dans le dictionnaire de La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, v p. 343b, a été corrigée en *enchaussumer* par Godefroy, III p. 99c. Wartburg⁶ a recueilli *chaumacer* "enduire de chaux" dans un texte de 1507 d'après Godefroy et une abondante moisson de formes verbales dans les patois gallo-romans: Normandie *cauchier* "caillouter"; Normandie *caucher*, Bessin *cochié*, Villette *chaüssier*, Val de Saire *caochie*, La Hague *câousée* "chauler"; Jersey *causer*, Guernesey *caûsair* "plâtrer"; Moselle *ršosyoe* "récrépir un mur"; Fosse-lez-Namur *tchaussi*, Val d'Aran *akawsadâ* "empierrer une route"; Mouzon *achauteler* "enduire de chaux." Le commentateur Bevens⁷ a trouvé *chemin chaucié* à la page 115 de sa thèse sur les Documents relatifs au comté de Champagne et de Brie publiés par Longnon, et il l'a défini dubitativement par "route couverte de chaux, chemin fait sur une chaussée, digue." A notre avis *chemin chaucié* dans ce document se rapporte au pavage qui forme la partie supérieure de la chaussée.

Tout à l'heure nous avons discuté le début du verbe *calciner* et du nom *calcination* au treizième siècle. La langue française a attendu longtemps avant de tirer d'autres dérivés de **calcinus*: *calcinement*, *calcineux*, *calcineur*, *calcinateur*, *calcinatoire* au seizième siècle, et les antonymes *calcinable* et *incalcinable* au dix-huitième siècle. Pour terminer ce dépouillement, nous voudrions attirer l'attention sur un hapax découvert dans *Ogier li Danois* par Godefroy, I p. 771b: *calceys* "chaussée." La lettre *l* manque aux nombreuses formes du mot dans Tobler-Lommatzsch, II 322-3. C'est justement ce terme qui a donné lieu à un désaccord que nous allons résumer.

⁵ P. Barbier, *Proc. Leeds Philos. Lit. Soc.: Lit. Hist. Section*, III (1934), p. 274.

⁶ Franz. etym. Wörterbuch, II (Leipzig, 1941), 108.

⁷ C. A. Bevens, *The Old French Vocabulary of Champagne* (Chicago, 1941).

Bloch explique dans son dictionnaire que *chaux* est tiré du latin classique *calx*, proprement "pierre," qui est le même mot que le grec *khalix*, auquel il doit le sens de "chaux" (cf. Ernout-Meillet). Ce rapport sémantique, qui nous paraît être tout à fait logique, aurait pu être étendu aux dérivés verbaux et par là obvier à une controverse fort débattue par les philologues. C'est une querelle qui a éclaté d'abord entre Diez et Littré à la recherche de l'étymologie du mot *chaussée*. Wartburg démontre que *chaussée* dérive du bas latin *calciata*, usité comme adjectif dans *via calciata* "voie dont une partie du pavage était renforcée avec de la chaux" en Catalogne dès 988 ou employé absolument par ellipse de *via* en France dès 1045. Dauzat⁸ fait fi d'une telle explication qui, dit-il, "est bien le type de l'étymologie livresque, élaborée sans compte tenu des réalités."⁹ Il fait observer que "la chaux, qui s'effrite sous la pression et qui sous l'action de l'eau se dilue en bouillie, est bien la dernière matière à laquelle on songerait pour renforcer le pavage . . . ; ce qui frappe dans la structure des voies romaines . . . c'est la profondeur de leurs fondations ou la hauteur des matériaux de soubassement superposés en lits successifs jusqu'au pavage supérieur." Cela l'amène à voir dans (*via*) *calciata* le classique *calceata*, qui est tiré de *calceus* "chaussure," et de l'interpréter par "(chemin) chaussé" où "chausser" devient synonyme de "buter, faire une élévation de terre."

Jules Vannérus s'oppose à cette opinion.¹⁰ Il voit un rapport absolument certain entre "chaussée" et "chaux" à cause des dénominations latines telles que *caminus calcis* à Wurtemberg en l'an 856 et encore une fois à Trèves au douzième siècle et *calcipetra* dans la Hesbaye liégeoise entre 1326 et 1357. L'examen de la composition du substrat des voies romaines le convainc qu'on y assurait la cohésion du pavage en employant des lits de pierre où il entraient un mélange de sable et de chaux désagrégée. Autrement dit, l'effritement de la chaux serait un avantage plutôt qu'un désavantage dans son emploi par les paveurs romains. Récemment Dauzat est rentré en lice.¹¹ Cette fois il admet que ce mode de structure des

⁸ Voir note 3.

⁹ L'étymologie de Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. etym. Wörterbuch*, art. 1533, pour être devenue livresque, n'en est pas moins basée sur des réalités.

¹⁰ *Archivum latinitatis medii aevi*, XVIII (1945), pages 5-24.

¹¹ *Le Français Moderne*, xv (1947), p. 74.

voies romaines offre une explication qui est plus raisonnable que celle de l'étymologie traditionnelle, mais il refuse de prendre au sérieux les nouveaux documents: celui de l'an 856, affirme-t-il, peut se rapporter à un four à chaux; celui du douzième siècle est une latinisation tardive sans valeur probante; celui qui contient le terme *calcipetra* peut être une mauvaise interprétation de "chaussée." L'essentiel reste pour lui le mode de structure des voies romaines aux puissants soubassements superposés et étayés. Bref Dauzat persiste à croire que *calciata* correspond à *calceata* tiré de *calceus*. C'est son avis en dépit de la note explicite que Vannérus a ajoutée à la page 24 de son article: dans ses recherches sur les chaussées romaines des mêmes régions, celui-ci n'avait trouvé un rappel de hauteur que dans des expressions contenant l'adjectif, par exemple, *alta calciata* en 1385 et en 1511 ou *haulte chaulcie* en 1545 et en 1668.

L'objection linguistique, que Dauzat a émise dans les deux articles du *Français Moderne* cités ci-dessus, lui semble encore plus importante. Il estime que la présence des deux verbes *calcare* "fouler" et *calceare* "chausser" faisait obstacle en latin à une dérivation verbale de même type d'après *calx* "chaux," qui aurait créé une homonymie intolérable; le bas latin a eu recours, à cet effet, à un autre suffixe, en greffant des dérivés de "chaux" sur *calcina*; l'ancien français s'est bien gardé de créer un **chaucier*, **chaussier* "passer à la chaux."

Un tel raisonnement n'emporte guère la conviction. Quant à l'histoire du mot, nous dirions que Dauzat a échoué dans son effort de faire table rase des trouvailles de Vannérus. Ni en bas latin ni en vieux français l'existence de dérivés verbaux de *calcina* ne faisait obstacle à l'existence de dérivés verbaux de *calx*. Quand Dauzat met un astérisque devant *chaucier* pour marquer qu'un tel dérivé fut intolérable au moyen âge, il fait preuve d'ignorer que le judéo-français connaît *chalz* "chaux" au onzième siècle, *chaciner* "enduire de chaux" au treizième siècle et surtout *chalcer* "enduire de chaux" au treizième siècle.¹² Ce dernier verbe est cité uniquement en judéo-français médiéval par Wartburg,¹³ mais tout à fait semblable est le judéo-espagnol *calçar* "plâtrer, enduire de chaux"

¹² *Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*, Extra Volume v (1943), art. 205.

¹³ Voir note 6.

relevé dans une traduction biblique du quatorzième siècle par Hauptmann.¹⁴ C'est vraiment dommage que Dauzat n'ait pas consulté l'ouvrage qui indique les deux sources de la glose *chalcer* dont la transcription ne laisse pas la moindre ombre d'un doute sur son rapport avec *calx*. Puisque ce verbe n'est pas hypothétique et qu'il peut être rattaché à *calciata*, il nous offre une preuve parmi beaucoup qui peuvent être alléguées par les romanistes et les latinistes qui préfèrent voir l'idée de "chaux" dans le vocable *chaussée*. C'est le parti que nous tenons à prendre ici.¹⁵

RAPHAEL LEVY

The University of Texas

MADAME VICTOR HUGO IN THE POETRY OF AUGUSTE VACQUERIE

As is well known to every student of the public and private life of Victor Hugo, Auguste Vacquerie (1819-1895) was one of his most loyal satellites for nearly half a century. Hugo's first letter to the younger man was written on August 1, 1836, in acknowledgment of some verses received from the sixteen-year-old poet who was still a student at the Collège Charlemagne in Paris.¹ Many years later, Hugo was to entrust Vacquerie with the famous instructions for his funeral and with the authority, which he was to share with Ernest Lefèvre (Vacquerie's nephew) and Paul Meurice, to publish those of his works which were still in manuscript.

Hugo's genius, however, was not the only magnet that drew and

¹⁴ O. H. Hauptmann, *Hispanic Review*, x (1942), p. 40, et xi (1943), p. 60. A ce propos on peut noter que, dans une thèse intitulée *Einige Bezeichnungen für den Begriff Strasse, Weg und Kreuzweg im Romanischen* (Aarau, 1926), p. 85, E. Hochuli a enregistré *kalsáda* "chaussée" en judéo-espagnol comme s'il s'agissait d'un substantif. Grâce à J. Subak, *Zts. rom. Phil.*, xxx (1906), p. 162, on apprend que les Juifs d'Istanbul l'emploient comme un participe passé de *kalsár* "chausser (des bas)," et qu'ils ont transcrit tant bien que mal le castillan moderne *calzada*.

¹⁵ Une autre ellipse de *via* est arrivée au début du lyonnais *charolesse* selon A. Thomas, *Mélanges d'étym. fran.* (Paris, 1902), 49. *Caussols* est discuté en dernier lieu par J. Hubschmid, *Rom. Phil.*, v (1952), 250.

¹ *Lettres à la fiancée—Correspondance I*, Paris, Albin Michel, 1947, pp. 550-551.

held Vacquerie in his orbit for almost fifty years. Not only was he the comrade and associate of the four Hugo children and brother-in-law of the eldest of them, Léopoldine, for a brief half-year, he was also the worshipful admirer of their mother, whom he rendered invaluable assistance during the painful period immediately following Hugo's banishment by Napoleon III. In *Victor Hugo raconté par un témoin de sa vie*, Mme Hugo has the following to say of Vacquerie's entrance into the family circle:

Une nouvelle génération arrivait. Quelque temps auparavant, un jeune homme de seize à dix-sept ans, qui achevait ses études au Collège Charlemagne voisin de la place Royale, s'était présenté chez M. Victor Hugo. C'était M. Auguste Vacquerie. Il avait amené, bientôt après, un de ses camarades de classe, M. Paul Meurice. Tous deux devinrent, et sont restés, les plus sûrs et les plus intimes amis de M. Victor Hugo.²

When Mme Hugo died in Brussels in 1868, her body was accompanied to Paris by Charles Hugo, Paul Meurice, and "the always faithful Auguste Vacquerie."³ It is only natural that this devotion, which lasted unabated for more than three decades, should have reflected itself in Vacquerie's poetry, and an examination of some of the poems may throw intriguing light on the attitude of the younger man towards the wife of his hero.

Vacquerie had just attained his majority when he published his first volume, a collection of verse entitled *L'Enfer de l'esprit* (Paris, Ebrard, 1840), and he was only eighteen when he wrote the fifth poem of this *recueil*, "A Madame V. H." (dated May, 1838). Awed by the sophistication of Paris, the young man expresses his gratitude, through twenty-nine alexandrine couplets, for being permitted to enjoy the warmth of the Hugo household, where he is cordially received by master and mistress alike as well as by their four children. He speaks of "les caprices du coeur entrevus vaguement," states that "je vais vous voir pour oublier ma vie," and thanks Mme Hugo because:

Vous avez recueilli ma jeunesse imprudente.
La voix de votre cœur a parlé dans mes bruits.
Vous m'avez relevé.⁴

² Bruxelles et Leipzig, Lacroix, Verbeckhoeven et Cie., 1863, II, 398.

³ E. M. Grant: *The Career of Victor Hugo*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1945, p. 286.

⁴ *L'Enfer de l'esprit*, p. 51.

What he owes to the great man and his wife is summed up in the following lines:

Le maître triomphant dont la foule entraînée
Salue avec amour la tête couronnée,
Lorsque j'ai dit son nom, est venu jusqu'à moi,
Et j'ai touché sa main comme la main d'un roi.
Et tandis qu'entr'ouvrant votre demeure aimée
Et les secrets trésors de votre renommée,
Vous redressiez mes pas perdus dans le chemin,
Il m'a fait croire à l'art, et vous au cœur humain.⁵

In the remaining thirty-four couplets of the poem, Vacquerie seems to be attempting to console Mme Hugo for the disillusionment consequent upon the unhappy termination of the lively friendships which marked the first years of her marital life—an obvious allusion to the break-up of "le cénacle de Joseph Delorme" and, perhaps, specifically to the behavior of Sainte-Beuve. He reminds her that among the present frequenters of her household are "des cœurs profonds et sûrs, des âmes vraiment hautes," mentioning Louis Boulanger by name and, of course, with himself and Paul Meurice in mind, and he remarks, in what might appear to be a tone of gentle reproof: "Vous n'avez pas le droit de vous plaindre, madame!"⁶ The "jeunes gens" who now frequent her home are "Joyeux de regarder—Votre figure où flotte un air de poésie."⁷ Vacquerie sums up the purpose of the entire poem in the final couplet:

Je tâche d'enfermer dans les flancs de mes vers
Toute votre maison qui rayonne à travers.⁸

This poem was re-worked by Vacquerie for inclusion in his second verse-collection, *Demi-teintes* (Paris, Garnier, 1845). The title, "A Madame V. H.," is lengthened to "A Madame la vicomtesse Victor H.," but the composition is shortened to only fourteen alexandrine couplets, the significant change being that Vacquerie gets to his point almost immediately. Whereas he needs

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁶ P. 53. It should be noted here that elsewhere in *l'Enfer de l'esprit*, particularly in the concluding poem, "Trente-un décembre," though the Hugos are not named, Vacquerie pays his debt of gratitude to "le couple rayonnant dont il sera parlé" (p. 312), with discreet hints as to the charm exercised on him by Mme Hugo.

⁷ P. 54.

⁸ P. 55.

ten verses in the first poem to lead up to the statement that, when he goes to her house, it is not only to bask in the glory of the master, "C'est pour vous qui—," etc., he arrives at this declaration, in the second poem, after only two introductory verses.⁹ The first twenty verses reproduce, with omissions similar to the one just indicated and some alterations, the first thirty-two of the earlier poem. To these are added four couplets which do not appear in *l'Enfer de l'esprit*; the first and last of these, however, as we shall see at once, were to reappear in another poetic setting. For the purpose of comparison, I quote these four lines:

O maison envinée! où, nés aux mêmes cieux,
L'esprit a ce grand front et le cœur ces grands yeux!

Et dont, réalisant l'idéal qu'on réclame,
Dieu veut qu'avec tout l'homme elle ait toute la femme.¹⁰

In 1872, more than a quarter of a century after *Demi-teintes*, Vacquerie published *Mes premières années de Paris*, a kind of versified record of his experiences in the capital from 1837 to the revolution of 1848.¹¹ Again there is a poem "A Madame Victor Hugo," this one completely independent of the other two except for the two couplets just quoted, which occur without break and in this altered form:

Maison deux fois bénie! où, nés aux mêmes cieux,
Le génie a ce front et la bonté ces yeux!
Où, prodiguant l'éclair, le rayon et la flamme,
Le sort avec tout l'homme a mis toute la femme!¹²

The remaining forty-one couplets of the poem strike a new and, to say the least, somewhat surprising note. Though the poet is reveling in the rustic delights of his native Villequier and in the charming companionship of his sister's family, he experiences the usual nostalgia for "ce sombre Paris dont je me croyais loin." The attraction, as always, is a double star: the master, "dont les deux

⁹ *L'Enfer de l'esprit*, p. 50, *Demi-teintes*, p. 45.

¹⁰ *Demi-teintes*, p. 46.

¹¹ The "nouvelle édition," Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1877, was used for this study. *Depuis* (Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1894) carries the record almost to the end of the poet's life.

¹² *Mes premières années de Paris*, p. 269. The citations in the rest of this paragraph are from the same and the following pages.

noms commencent, — Victor comme Virgile et Hugo comme Homère," and his warm-hearted helpmate,

Sourire de sa gloire, ange de cet esprit,
Vous dans le firmament à cet astre accouplée
Comme au soleil de juin une nuit étoilée.

He surmises that, at the moment he is writing his poem, Mme Hugo is in the Place Royale with the " quatre beaux enfants à votre âme pareils ; " nevertheless :

Vous ne me quittez pas. Vous doutez-vous parfois
Que vous vous promenez avec moi dans les bois ?

And, after imagining that she had visited the Gothic church of Caudebec with him on the previous day, he declares, in language so prosaic as to suggest embarrassment on his part, as though he might have been trying to conceal deeper feelings :

Je vous ai si bien là que j'aurais peine à dire
Quelle stupidité me pousse à vous écrire
Quand je peux vous parler, et quel est mon travers
De m'en aller jeter à la poste ces vers
Et vous les adresser où vous ne pouvez être,
Et que je suis tenté de brûler cette lettre.

He summons her, then : " N'importe, venez vite. Ici tout vous attend." The fact that Vacquerie never married may be without significance in this connection. Two points, however, should be noted. The first is that this poem was probably written some time in 1843, since it precedes, in *Mes premières années de Paris*, two compositions, " Leur mariage " and " Cinq mois après," which are concerned with the marriage and death of Charles Vacquerie and Léopoldine Hugo. The second is that it was not published until four years after the death of Mme Hugo, who may be supposed, therefore, never to have been aware of its existence. In any case, the poem testifies to a very deep attachment, on the part of Vacquerie, to the self-effacing wife of his great master.

As though no collection of Vacquerie's verse could be complete without a tribute to the woman he admired so much, *Depuis* also has its " A Madame Victor Hugo." It is the first of a group of poems, " Mes années de Jersey," written during the exile the first half of which Vacquerie shared with Victor Hugo, and it pays

homage to Mme Hugo's courage, serenity, and devotion during this trying period. Just as her daily visits to the Conciergerie had brightened the cells in which the four young editors of *l'Événement* had been imprisoned, so now she brings the balm of her presence to the exiles, herself a voluntary exile:

Vous prenez votre part de la lutte sans trêve,
Et c'est notre vaillance indomptable de voir
Luire paisiblement sur notre morne grève
Votre beau front qui fait sourire le devoir.¹³

Though he never again specifically refers to her in his poetry, there are innumerable references to their friendship in the correspondence that passed between him and the husband and wife upon whom he constantly heaped so much adulation. It is safe to assume that the memory of Mme Hugo was often with Vacquerie during the twenty-seven years that separated his death from hers.

AARON SCHAFER

The University of Texas.

THE CURTAL SONNETS OF GERARD MANLEY HOPKINS

Hopkins' three Curtal Sonnets, "Pied Beauty," "Peace" and "Ash Boughs," appear to be lyric pieces of ten and one-half lines with a rhyme scheme approximating the Italian sonnet. Closer study shows that they are purposeful and considered variations of the Petrarchan sonnet. Hopkins was not the man to establish a new form, and he did not break or ignore the rules of the genre in undisciplined exasperation; he carefully modified them to fit his needs for creative expression.

Hopkins' title for these sonnets is interesting: "Curtal" originally referred to a horse that had had its tail docked; and thus a Curtal Sonnet would be, literally, a "bob-tailed" or short sonnet. Hopkins was a theorist and a meticulous craftsman. His Curtal Sonnets are as carefully calculated as his other poems. The theory that lies behind Hopkins' composition of the shortened sonnets is found in the Author's Preface to his poems:

¹³ *Depuis*, p. 45.

Some of the sonnets in this book are in five foot, some in six foot or alexandrine line.

Nos. 13 and 22 are Curtal Sonnets, that is they are constructed in proportion resembling those of the sonnet proper, namely, $6 + 4$ instead of $8 + 6$, with however a halfline tailpiece (so that the equation is rather $\frac{12}{2} + \frac{9}{2} = \frac{21}{2} = 10\frac{1}{2}$).¹

The relation of the two divisions of the Curtal Sonnet ($6:4\frac{1}{2}$) is proportionally identical with those of the Petrarchan sonnet ($8:6$) for the fraction $\frac{12}{2}$ is to $\frac{9}{2}$ as 8 is to 6 and both reduce to the expression $\frac{4}{3}$.²

We must first make the point that there are two ways of looking at the sonnet. One way is placing an emphasis on the strict classical form of the sonnet; the other is considering the amount of meaning that can be held in the sonnet mould. Hopkins considered that the English sonnet failed in perfection because in the transition of the form from Italian to English, the number of syllables did not correspond. In Italian, he argued quite reasonably, there was a natural ellipsis brought about by slurring three or four initial vowels, and the syllables themselves were longer in Italian. In comparison, therefore, with the Italian line of fourteen or fifteen syllables, the English line of ten syllables was considerably shorter and that made it "short, light, tripping and trifling."³ Hopkins never repudiated the genre he chose to use. He saw two kinds of sonnets, English and Italian. Extrinsicly they were the same; but intrinsicly they were different, and that difference was in the language. In a balloon filled with air, one can increase the pressure by inflating the balloon with more air, or by compressing the size of the balloon. In order to approximate the "pressure" of the Italian sonnet, Hopkins enlarged most of his sonnets by various technical devices, such as: the use of a six and even an eight beat line; the use of a coda; and in the "Terrible" sonnets, the use of longer syllables and ellipsis.⁴ In the Curtal Sonnets Hopkins

¹ Author's Preface, *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, Third ed. (Oxford University Press, London, 1949), 10.

² William Henry Gardner, *Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Martin Secker & Warburg, London, 1944), I, 100, seems to have missed the point of Hopkins' equation, for he assumes there is no significance in the number $10\frac{1}{2}$.

³ Claude Collier Abbott, *The Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins* to Richard Watson Dixon (Oxford University Press, London, 1935), 86.

⁴ Gardner, *op. cit.*, 82-108.

reversed his position and considered the sonnet from the English point of view. This time he kept the amount of meaning in the English sonnet constant and altered the extrinsic form to fit. It appears, then, that in the Curtal Sonnets Hopkins was trying to do in ten and one-half lines what the other English sonneteers were doing in fourteen. Hopkins had the same amount of meaning in his Curtal Sonnets; he merely made the sonnet more compact by shortening the external form.

The form of the Curtal Sonnet compares recognizably to that of the Petrarchan sonnet. The Petrarchan sonnet, in general, consists of a single statement of an idea harmonizing with the division of the poem into quatrains and tercets. The pause required by the sense occurs with almost perfect regularity at the end of the line, a complete break anywhere inside the line being avoided. Petrarch used two rhyme schemes which are today regarded as the only acceptable ones: that is, the octave always rhyming *abba, abba*; and the sestet either *cde, dcd*; or *cde, cde*. Nineteenth century critics insisted on a definite break in thought between the octave and the sestet. We shall see in the following analysis of "Pied Beauty" how closely Hopkins followed the rules:

Glory be to God for dappled things—

For skies of couple-colour as a brinded cow;

For rose-moles all in stipple upon trout that swim.

Fresh-firecoal chestnut-falls; finches' wings;

Landscape plotted and pieced—fold, fallow, and plough;

And áll trádes, their gear and tackle and trim.

All things counter, original, spare, strange;

Whatever is fickle, freckled (who knows how?)

With swift, slow; sweet, sour; adazzle, dim;

He fathers-forth whose beauty is past change:

Praise him.

The division of thought in this Curtal Sonnet is six lines in the major section and four in the minor section, the tail-piece being a dimeter. The idea in the major part consists of examples of pied beauty in the world; the idea in the minor part draws the generalization about the Creator of this beauty. The further subdivision required by the sonnet seems to fall into the pattern 3, 3, 3, 1½. The perfect subdivision would be 3, 3, 2½, 2½ if the Curtal Sonnet

could be broken down that far. The rhyme scheme is abc, abc; dbcd, c.

Dr. Bridges comments that the rhythm is sprung, the feet falling Paenonic.⁵ G. F. Lahey states that there are four beats to the line and scans the first two lines as follows:

Glōry bē tō / Gōd fōr / dāppled / things—
Fōr / skies ōf cōuple- / colour ās ā / brīnded / cōw; *

W. H. Gardner does not scan the poem but mentions that "Pied Beauty" is written in a five stress line.⁷ It seems to me that there is room for argument on this point. However, since Hopkins commented in the Author's Preface that "Some of the Sonnets in this book are in five foot, some in six foot or alexandrine line"⁸ and made no mention of a four beat line, it seems logical that he intended a five beat line. The style is simple compared to Hopkins' other work. The phrasing is direct instead of inverted and there are no word clusters, massed figures of speech or rove-over lines.

The Curtal Sonnets, "Peace" and "Ash Boughs,"⁹ both follow the general pattern of "Pied Beauty." The division of thought in the poems is six in the major section and four in the minor section, the break occurring at the end of the major section, and the tailpiece in each being a trimeter. Each of the Curtal Sonnets is varied slightly, however. "Peace" is written in alexandrines and the rhyme scheme is abc, abc; dbcd, c. The subdivision of thought falls in a pattern approximating 2½, 3½, 1, 3½. In "Ash Boughs," Hopkins expanded the Curtal Sonnet by the use of mechanical devices: sprung rhythm, word clusters, phrasing and rove-over lines. Here, as in the case of "Pied Beauty," there is an argument over the scansion. Dr. Bridges comments in the notes that "Ash

⁵ Bridges' Notes, *Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Oxford University Press, London, 1949), 229.

⁶ G. F. Lahey, *Gerard Manley Hopkins* (Oxford University Press, London, 1930), 123.

⁷ Gardner, *op. cit.*, 100.

⁸ See note 1.

⁹ The version considered is the first. The second version was edited not by Hopkins but by Bridges and, therefore, is not being included in this paper. See Bridges' Notes, *op. cit.*, 259.

Boughs" is in five stress lines.¹⁰ W. H. Gardner in a footnote states that "Ash Boughs" is in alexandrines.¹¹ In this poem it seems clear that the meter is sprung and intended to be five stresses to the line. The rhyme scheme of "Ash Boughs" is abc, abc; bddb, c, and the subdivision of thought is approximately 3, 3, 3, 1½. This poem is the most expanded and most complex of the Curtal Sonnets. It is more experimental than the other two, not only because there are two versions but also because of the change in style and diction.

The variation in the Curtal Sonnets shows that the form conceived by Hopkins was experimental. However, the close comparison between the Curtal Sonnet and the Petrarchan sonnet must be considered as more than a coincidence. W. H. Gardner concludes that the Curtal Sonnet is "a perfect medium for the expression of a lyrical impulse which is intellectually too slight to fill up the normal sonnet-mould."¹² This conclusion dismisses the Curtal Sonnets too lightly. According to Hopkins the sonnet in English of fourteen lines was loose and flabby. He wished to tighten it and make the form compact around the idea.

The Curtal Sonnets, then, represent an interesting sidelight on Hopkins' theorizing on the Petrarchan sonnet. The shortened form presents a parallel to Hopkins' coda sonnets; for in the caudated sonnets of eighteen and twenty lines, he aimed at expanding the sonnet beyond its usual scope, and in the Curtal Sonnets he compressed the form to ten and one-half lines. Hopkins had no authority for the shortened version of the sonnet as he had the authority of Milton and the early Italian sonneteers for the coda sonnets. Thus, the Curtal Sonnets are an expression of his own originality and present an unprecedented analogue to the regular Petrarchan sonnet.

LOIS W. PITCHFORD

Ann Arbor, Michigan

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Gardner, *op. cit.*, 100.

¹² *Ibid.*

SUGGESTED DATES FOR MORE OF LOPE DE VEGA'S
COMEDIAS¹

1. *La boda entre dos maridos*. In act III, Dorena, a Parisian lady, asks Andronio, "¿De la corte sois?"; and he replies, "Señora, / de Madrid soy."² If, as appears likely, this is to be considered an affirmative answer, placing the court in Madrid, the play must have been written before the removal of the court to Valladolid in 1601, or after its return to Madrid in 1606. The spread of dates proposed by Morley and Bruerton is 1595-1608,³ which would allow for either possibility; but they then add, "probably 1595-1603"³ and further state that the play is possibly *El casamiento dos veces*, which Lope mentioned in the first edition of *El peregrino en su patria*.³ Given the possibility that *La boda entre dos maridos* may be the play from the *Peregrino* list, together with the thoroughly proven reliability of the M-B findings, it seems highly probable that the conversation quoted above antedates the removal of the court to Valladolid; in which case the date would be: 1595-1601.

2. *Peribáñez y el comendador de Ocaña*. In the famous scene in which Peribáñez and his company prepare to march off to fight the Moors, the following dialogue occurs:

Peribáñez. ¿Tan viejo estáis ya, Belardo?
Belardo. El gusto se acabó ya.
Peribáñez. Algo dél os quedará
bajo del capote pardo.⁴

While a later speech, in which Belardo has been thought to mention his age in years, has received more attention from scholars who have come to grips with the *Peribáñez* . . . riddle, it may be that the lines just quoted also offer a possible solution. Dr. Bruerton has

¹ I wish to thank Professor S. G. Morley for his helpful suggestions during the preparation of these notes.

² *Obras de Lope de Vega, publicadas por la Real Academia Española* (Madrid, 1890-1913), XIV, 600a. In later notes, this edition will be referred to as *Acad.*

³ *The Chronology of Lope de Vega's COMEDIAS* (New York, 1940), 177. This book will henceforth be called *Chronology*, and its authors M-B.

⁴ *Peribáñez y el comendador de Ocaña*, ed. by Ch.-V. Aubrun and J.-F. Montesinos (Paris, 1943), 131, lines 2334-2337.

conclusively demonstrated that it is unwise to read too much of Lope's autobiography into Belardo's speeches in this or any play;⁵ but in view of a point that he makes elsewhere in the same article, the present writer is moved to suggest that this dialogue may have to do with the termination of Lope's liaison with Micaela de Luján. It may be, of course, that the passage refers merely to Lope's well-known predilection for the fair sex in general; but let us also examine the case that can be made for a reference to the affair with Micaela. If this latter line of reasoning is followed, one might infer that "viejo" is used figuratively to indicate the protracted nature of this affair, and that the "gusto" of the next line could be the pleasure that Lope undoubtedly derived from it. Considering the length and intensity of the affair, Peribáñez would certainly be justified in telling Belardo that "Algo dél os quedará . . .," as it undoubtedly did in Lope's thoughts for many years thereafter.

Another aspect of this hypothesis also deserves consideration. Toward the conclusion of his highly stimulating discussion of *Peribáñez* . . . , Dr. Bruerton stresses the significance of the fact that the play has a character named Luján, a lackey serving the Comendador.⁶ This, Dr. Bruerton believes, may well be as valid a criterion for Lopean chronology as the combination of Belardo and Lucinda.⁷ The Luján of *Peribáñez* . . . is a decidedly unsavory character, who acts as his master's go-between in the dishonorable pursuit of Casilda. Can this unsympathetic portrayal of Luján, together with Belardo's remark that "El gusto se acabó ya," be interpreted as meaning that Lope's relationship with Micaela came to an end under circumstances which were distasteful to him, and which caused him to feel considerable bitterness toward his former innamorata? Another possible interpretation is simply that Lope would not have been willing to portray unfavorably a character named Luján, while he was in love with a woman who bore the same name. In either case, this is obviously mere conjecture, and no claim beyond that is made for it; but it would suggest 1608 as a likely date for the play, and thus is consistent with the *terminus ad quem* proposed by Dr. Bruerton.⁸

⁵ *Hispanic Review*, xvii, 1 (January, 1949), 35-39.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁷ Cf. C. Bruerton, "Lope's Belardo-Lucinda Plays," *Hispanic Review*, v (1937), 309-315.

⁸ *Hispanic Review*, xvii, 1 (January, 1949), 45; also, *ibid.*, 46.

3. *San Isidro, labrador de Madrid*. Shortly after Isidro's death, the glories that will be associated with his name are foretold by a personification of the river Manzanares, which speaks of

. . . la emperatriz Isabel
del tercer Felipe abuela . . . *

This reference to Felipe III suggests a *terminus a quo* of September, 1598, for the play, and as such has the effect of narrowing slightly the span of 1597-1608 given by M-B.¹⁰ The presence of D. Pedro de Luxán among the characters may, however, limit still further the outside dates for the play, in view of Dr. Bruerton's belief that a character named Luján fixes the date of a Lopean play between 1599 and 1608.¹¹ This being the case, the date should be: 1599-1608, probably 1604-1606.¹²

4. *La viuda valenciana*. In the second act, Rosano, listed in the cast as a *cortesano*,¹³ discusses life at the court with Lucencio. The latter asks him when he left Madrid, and then inquires, "¿Hay nuevas?," only to have Rosano tell him, "No sé cosa de provecho."¹⁴ This conversation seems definitely to place the court in Madrid, and before the removal to Valladolid, since the play appears in the first *Peregrino* list (finished late in 1603), and is therefore dated 1595-1603 by M-B.¹⁵ Rosano's inability to provide Lucencio with news is significant, however; for Cabrera de Córdoba informs us, in an entry for January 1, 1600, that at that time there was already talk of moving the court.¹⁶ If Lope had access to such rumors—and his range of acquaintances was no doubt wide—he could hardly have represented a courtier as saying that nothing newsworthy was going on at the court, if so great a change were already being contemplated. In other words, the dialogue between Rosano and

⁹ *Acad.*, IV, 589a.

¹⁰ *Chronology*, 239.

¹¹ *Cf.* above, n. 8.

¹² *Cf. Chronology*, 239.

¹³ *Acad.*, XV, 493.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 514a.

¹⁵ *Chronology*, 156.

¹⁶ *Pelaciones de las cosas sucedidas en la corte de España, desde 1599 hasta 1614* (Madrid, 1857), 56: "Dícese que se platica de mudar la corte á Valladolid."

Lucencio, coupled with the statement by Cabrera de Córdoba, almost surely keeps the play within the sixteenth century, and its date would consequently be: 1595-1599.

RICHARD W. TYLER

The University of Texas

THE LADIES OF CRISTÓBAL DE CASTILLEJO'S LYRICS

As is well known Gutierre de Cetina veiled the names of two ladies who were the object of his sincere passion with such care that to this day the identity of one of them, Dórida, has not been conclusively determined. He wanted to keep her identity secret yet actually challenged his readers to find out who she was. Cristóbal de Castillejo, unlike Gutierre de Cetina, mentioned the names of several ladies in his lyrics, but did not feel obliged to use fictitious names, probably because he experienced neither a secret nor sincere passion for them. It is true that he generally mentioned them by their given names only, but surely not because he wished to conceal their identity. It is also true that, with the exception of Anna von Schaumburg, we do not know definitely who the ladies of his lyrics were in real life other than that they must have been social acquaintances and friends of the poet. Castillejo was a court poet and his lyrics were undoubtedly in great demand by the ladies for whom he wrote them.

Miss Nicolay¹ has listed the names of most of these ladies, but her list can be made more nearly complete by the addition of four, perhaps five, others, and in one instance the finding of a name can serve as an aid in interpreting the poem in which it occurs. Miss Nicolay lists Ana (Anna von Schaumburg), Doña Ana de Aragón, Doña Luisa, Francisca, Inés, Mencía, Gracia, Julia,² Doña Petronila, Señora de Lerma and Angela.

¹ Clara Leonora Nicolay, *The Life and Works of Cristóbal de Castillejo*. University of Pennsylvania diss. Philadelphia, 1910, p. 32.

² This Julia probably does not refer to any lady of Castillejo's acquaintance. E. Mele ["Postilla a tre poesie del Castillejo," *RFE*, xvi (1929), 60-65] points out that "A una dama que se decia Julia" is a translation of a Latin epigram *Ad Juliam*. Cf. Burman, *Ant. vet. Lat. epigr. et poem.* Amsterdam, I (1759), 650.

To these names can be added two obvious ones: María in "A una doncella que se metió monja"³ and Elena in "Carta a una dama en ella contenida."⁴

In "A otra señora, su compañera, cuyo sobrenombre va aquí"⁵ we find the lady's surname, Gómez, made up of the last syllable of the first line and the first syllable of the second line:

Mi triste vivir amargo,
Mezclado con mi pesar.

In "Otras a la tercera,"⁶ which is composed of three stanzas of two *quintillas* each, the first letter of each *quintilla* taken in sequence spells out the name Luysa D. This Luisa may be the same as the one mentioned in "A una dama que tenía muchos servidores."⁷

An entirely new name appears, also half hidden, in a much admired, but not well understood, lyric entitled "Sueño."⁸ Miss Nicolay, in discussing this poem, says:

A similar fervor is expressed in another beautiful poem called "A Dream" (*Sueño*). He tells a lady that he had a dream, "such as he ought not to have dreamt." The time was the month of May; he found himself in a lovely verdant spot on the banks of a clear river. He was free from care, there seemed endless spring in this enchanting place—but the "voice of his torments awakened him and shattered the sweet dream." He found himself "a prisoner on a barren rock, where only death could free him."⁹

She then goes on to say: "We are ignorant of the circumstances which prompted this poem, but it seems, indeed, a symbol of the poet's life; he found himself a prisoner on a barren rock, and only death could free him."¹⁰

My own opinion is that this poem is just another Castillejo love lyric, charmingly done, it is true, but I do not believe that we have here "a symbol of the poet's life," except insofar as it reveals his customary poetical infatuation for a lady who is disdainful or indifferent. The first and last stanzas of the poem are:

³ *Cristóbal de Castillejo, Obras*, edición y notas de J. Domínguez Bordona (Clásicos castellanos, vol. 79, Madrid, 1927) p. 260.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 165.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

Yo, señora, me soñaba
Un sueño que no debiera:
Que por mayo me hallaba
En un lugar do miraba
Una muy linda ribera,
Tan verde, florida y bella,
Que de miralla y de vella
Mil cuidados deseché,
Y con solo uno quedé
Muy grande, por gozar della.

Lexos de mi pensamiento
Dend'a poco me hallé,
Que así durmiendo contento,
A la voz de mi tormento
El dulce sueño quebré;
Y hallé que la ribera
Es una montaña fiera,
Muy áspera de subir,
Donde no espero salir
De cautivo hasta que muera.

The poem is composed of six stanzas of two *quintillas* each, and the first letter of each stanza spells the name Ysabel. And I venture the suggestion that the poet also mentions Isabel's surname: Ribera. If the poem is read with this in mind it tells us that he dreamed that he was contemplating his pretty lady (linda ribera) in a pleasant and harmonious natural setting, and he thought the summer time of love for this lady would never end. He woke up realizing that dream is not reality, that his ribera is not as he dreamed it (her) but a montaña of inaccessibility wherein he will remain her slave until death.

With this interpretation the poem conforms with many another love lyric by Castillejo.

GEORGE IRVING DALE

Cornell University

VANCE THOMPSON'S PLAGIARISM OF TEODOR DE WYZEWA'S ARTICLES ON MALLARMÉ

The remarks on Mallarmé's esthetic theories and the *exégèses* of his poems published by Vance Thompson in periodical form in 1895 and in the book *French Portraits* in 1900 were lifted from the essays

of Teodor de Wyzewa collected in 1895 under the title *Nos maîtres*.¹ Thompson specifically claimed that the stolen texts represented his original contribution to Symbolist criticism: "I wish to give as clear an explanation as I can of the symbol as Mallarmé used it. . . . So far as I know, no helpful analysis has yet been made" (WPP, FP). Critics have taken him at his word, praising his purloined commentaries.²

It would be a waste of space to reproduce in full Thompson's unacknowledged cento of translations. For the sake of illustration, they may be divided into three types: (a) remarks on Symbolist esthetics; (b) *gloses* or *exégèses* of poems; and (c) misinterpretations of the source. The following specimens will show Thompson's procedure for group (a):

THOMPSON

. . . Stéphane Mallarmé, for instance, this bizarre poet who for the last 20 years has published incomprehensible poems in obscure re-

WYZEWA

. . . Un poète bizarre qui depuis dix, depuis vingt ans . . . publie . . . en des feuilles obscures, certains vers incompréhensibles, sous

¹ The relevant materials are as follows, and will be referred to by the indicated abbreviations: Vance Thompson, "Wagnerian Poets and Painters," *M'lle New York*, August 1895 (WPP); "The Technique of the Symbolists," *M'lle New York*, Nov. 1895 (TS); *French Portraits*, Boston, 1900, Ch. "Stéphane Mallarmé" (FP). Wyzewa's articles first appeared in 1885-1887 in *La Vogue*, *La Revue wagnérienne*, and *La Revue indépendante* before being re-issued in *Nos maîtres*, Paris, Perrin, 1895 (NM). Thompson's eclectic borrowings make it evident that he used the collected essays and not the original periodicals.

² Harry Thurston Peck, *The Bookman*, x (Feb. 1900), 568: "Were everything in this book as serious, as valuable as his explanation of the Symbolistic theory of Mallarmé, he would have deserved well both of his readers and of his reviewers." Jane G. Cook, in *The Bookbuyer*, March 1900, found "the essence of Mallarmé's complicated style . . . lucidly set forth." René Taupin in *L'Influence du symbolisme français sur la poésie américaine*, Paris, 1929, p. 38 states that Thompson's article on the Symbolists "fut très remarqué." In my own article, "Early English and American Critics of French Symbolism," in *Studies in Honor of Frederick W. Shipley*, St. Louis, 1942, pp. 172 ff., Thompson's commentaries were cited to prove a claim for the priority of an American critic's understanding of Symbolism over that of any British critic writing before 1900. Such a claim, made in ignorance of Thompson's source, now appears considerably weakened, though it is still supported by Alice Gorren's article "The French Symbolists," *Scribner's*, January-June 1893.

THOMPSON

views under his high sounding pseudonym. (WPP)

Mallarmé . . . sees all things as symbols. A hospital? It is the life of man. A bell-ringer? The poet, clamant for the ideal. And a rose is Herodias. (WPP)

Other poets have believed that poetry should be pure music, but Mallarmé believes that it should signify something and indeed create a life. Create a life? Poetry, art of rythms and sound, ought, being a music, to create emotions. Now the emotions, it is evident, are inseparable from their causes, from the ideas that evoke them. Pleasure nor grief exist abstractly; there are pleasant ideas or grievous ones. (WPP, TS, FP)

The symbol is his motif which he develops logically and inevitably, through premeditated syllables, evocative of certain emotions. (TS, FP)

Mallarmé's theory is that the object of poetry is emotions justified by the subjects. (TS)

The five borrowed gloses of group (b) may be illustrated by the following fragments from Wyzewa's *déchiffrement* of "Surgi de la croupe et du bond":

THOMPSON

There is on the table a vase, delicate, fragile, in which lately the flowers stood radiant. The poet perceives it. . . . Sadly the poet muses that no flower is there to console his

WYZEWA

ce nom — évidemment un pseudonyme; — Stéphane Mallarmé. (NM, p. 91)

Une tendance, par exemple, à voir toute chose comme des symboles. Un hôpital? C'est notre vie. Le Sonneur? c'est le poète invoquant l'idéal. La rose? c'est Hérodiade. (NM, pp. 97-98)

Les poètes antérieurs avaient fait une pure musique. . . . Mallarmé crut que la poésie devait signifier quelque chose, créer un mode entier de la vie . . . créer une vie. Mais quelle vie? . . . La poésie, art des rythmes et des sons, devait, étant une musique, créer des émotions. Or, les émotions . . . sont inséparables de leurs causes, des idées qui les provoquent. Le plaisir, la douleur abstraits n'existent point: il y a seulement des idées joyeuses ou pénibles. (NM, p. 99)

. . . développement logique et nécessaire d'un motif, agencement prémédité des syllabes, dans le motif même, afin de produire une émotion totale. (NM, p. 95)

Des émotions justifiées par des sujets, c'est l'objet de la poésie. Telle est la règle de Mallarmé. (NM, p. 100)

WYZEWA

Sur la table, un vase, un mince vase où naguère des fleurs s'irradiaient. Le poète l'aperçoit. . . . Tristement le poète songe que nulle fleur n'est à consoler son amère

THOMPSON

bitter vigil. And here, I take it, is the point of poetical departure. . . . Can he not by his sovereign will evoke one flower? . . . Etc. (TS, FP)

WYZEWA

veillée. C'est le point de départ poétique. . . . Ne peut-il l'évoquer, de par son vouloir souverain? . . . Etc. (NM, pp. 119-120)

As for group (c), Thompson in many instances perverted Wyzewa's meaning. In 1895 he appears to have taken seriously an ironic reference to Mallarmé's name as a pseudonym (WPP, cited above). Wyzewa states that the Parnassians "pour rendre plus facile leur tâche de musiciens, ont choisi des sujets à dessein banals ou vides" (NM, p. 93)—in Thompson, it is Mallarmé who "chooses banal subjects" (WPP). But the most flagrant mistake occurs when Thompson cites, within quotation marks, Wyzewa's paraphrase of "Prose pour Des Esseintes" and "Toast funèbre," attributing these texts to Mallarmé himself: "This is from the prose for 'Des Esseintes'" and "He wrote this of Gautier" (TTS, FP). Thompson apparently did not know that "Prose pour Des Esseintes" was the title of a poem in verse form.

The index of poets, novelists, critics, musicians, and artists at the end of *French Portraits* betokens a rather extensive familiarity with continental art and literature on the part of an American of that period; but it significantly lacks the name of Wyzewa, whose ideas and writings not only brought Thompson his chief fame, but also served in 1895 to start him on his career as a critic of French poetry. It would appear now that his only slim justification for a claim on the interest of posterity rests on plagiarism, and that his once-praised commentaries on Mallarmé and Symbolism must be restored to Teodor de Wyzewa.

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

Washington University

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ABRIDGMENT OF LA
CALPRENÈDE'S *FARAMOND*

Although most *romans de longue haleine* had lost their appeal by 1715, Alexandre-Nicolas de la Rochefoucauld, Marquis de

Surgères (1709-1760), mentioned in Voltaire's *Temple du Goût*,¹ offered to the public as late as 1753 an abridgment in four volumes of La Calprenède's last novel.² Although he was at first hesitant about whether he should condense *Le Grand Cyrus* or *Faramond*, he was finally persuaded to favor the latter novel by a lady

dont le goût est aussi sûr que son esprit est éclairé & son caractère aimable . . . ses raisons étoient que les caractères étant plus variées & la Fable mieux conduite que dans *Cyrus*, le Roman de *Faramond* meritoit par préférence, qu'on cherchât à en faire sentir les beautés, en les rapprochant.*

A further indication that interest in La Calprenède's novels was not lacking is furnished by the fact that Surgères assures his readers that he has taken pains to preserve La Calprenède's colorful style and "grandeur d'âme," that he has retained everything "d'intéressant, de pathétique, de noble et d'agréable." He admits that the novelist at times becomes "empoulé," "gigantesque," "obscur ou puérile," but claims

d'avoir supprimé ces froides dissertations, ces longs monologues, ces descriptions fastidieuses de palais, de jardins; d'avoir raccourci ces conversations, qui sont plutôt un jeu & une affectation de l'esprit de l'Auteur, que l'expression naturelle ou vraisemblable de ce que pensent ou doivent penser les personnages qu'il fait parler. Je n'ai pas moins été sévère, par rapport à la plupart des évanouissemens de ces Héros, si grands les armes à la main, si foibles en aimant. J'ai cru qu'on pouvoit, sans les rendre moindre amoureux, leur faire soutenir plus dignement les caprices du sort & les malheurs de l'amour.⁴

¹ *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire*, Paris, Garnier, 1877, VIII, 599:

Ne craignez point, jeune Surgère,
D'employer des soins assidus
Aux beaux vers que vous savez faire.

² *Faramond*, Paris, Bauche, 1753. The *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, Delagrave, n. d. XXXVI, 224 is unaware of any ante-mortem publication: [Surgères] n'écrivit que pour ses amis et ne mit jamais sous presse aucune production de sa plume. Ce ne fut qu'en 1802 que Serieys tira de ses nombreux manuscrits un volume in-8 de 434 pages. . . ."

³ *Préface*, i-ii. Surgères elsewhere shows an interest in the period during which *Faramond* takes place, but he designates Faramond's son as the first to acquire "le titre de roi." Cf. Antoine Serieys (1755-1829), *Œuvres de la Rochefoucauld, Marquis de Surgères, Lieutenant-Colonel des Armées du Roi, etc.*, Paris, Gerard, 1802, 110. Surgères also abridged La Calprenède's *Cassandra*. Cf. Brunet, *Manuel de Libraire*, Berlin, Altmann, 1922, III, col. 725. Neither novel is in the Serieys edition.

⁴ *Préface*, iii ff. Cf. my *La Calprenède's Faramond*, Baltimore, The Johns

For the benefit of the reader, he adds a *Table Géographique de diverses Provinces, Villes, etc., mentionnées dans le Roman de Faramond & rapprochées de la Géographie nouvelle*.⁵

The nineteen intercalated stories of La Calprenède's novel are all included. The order in which these stories are presented in the original version is maintained, even to the breaks in the stories of Varanès, Angelmond, Vallia, and Gunderic,⁶ so that the actual and related episodes are interwoven in the same pattern with an identical number of transitions from direct to indirect and back to direct narration.

The first volume (477 pp.) is based upon the first and part of the second volume of La Calprenède's novel. The second volume (490 pp.) goes to the end of La Calprenède's fifth volume. The third volume (553 pp.) goes through the eighth volume of the earlier romance, and the concluding volume (530 pp.) contains the material in the last four volumes of the original version. The material in the first volume is the least condensed, and the last volume is the only one to present the contents of as many as four volumes. The twelve volumes of La Calprenède and Vaumorière, containing about 4000 pages, are reduced to four somewhat larger volumes totalling about 2000 pages. Thus, the abridgment is half the size of the original.

La Calprenède and Vaumorière give about 3000 pages to the intercalated stories. One might therefore expect about 1500 pages of the condensed version to be devoted to related narrative. There are, however, only about 1100 pages in this category, a considerable reduction which leads to the conclusion that abridgment was more easily achieved in the intercalated stories. There are 1000 pages of direct narrative in La Calprenède's novel and 900 pages in the condensation so that only 100 of the original 1000 pages devoted to direct narration are omitted. The principal action is thereby presented in practically the same manner as in the Seventeenth Century romance in spite of the shrinkage.

The claims made by Surgères in his preface appear to be made in anticipation of Boileau-inspired criticism. If he had managed

Hopkins Press, 1938, 165 ff.; *Bibliothèque Universelle des Romans*, Février, 1776, 74; Octobre, 1777, II, 6.

⁵ *Préface*, xv-xxii.

⁶ Cf. my *op. cit.*, 74.

to eliminate all the elements that he indicates in his preface, there would be far fewer pages in his adaptation. It is apparent that Surgères paid greater homage than he knew to La Calprenède when he retained nine-tenths of the direct narrative nearly one hundred years after the appearance of the first edition of the novel.⁷

SPIRE PITOU

Marquette University

THE TREATMENT OF "SAUDADE DA PÁTRIA" BY
CERTAIN BRAZILIAN ROMANTIC POETS

Perhaps the one most famous and most often quoted poem of Brazilian literature is the "Canção do exílio," by Gonçalves Dias. Nevertheless, this expression of "saudade" which was referred to by José Veríssimo, in his *História da literatura brasileira*, as "a expressão mais intensa e mais exacta do nosso intimo sentimento patrio," does not stand alone in Brazilian Romantic poetry.

Gonçalves de Magalhães, whose diplomatic career kept him for many years away from his own country, makes the greatest display of "saudade" of the Romantic poets. Although Magalhães lacks depth of feeling, two principal notes may be seen in a considerable number of his poetic writings: fervent patriotism and veneration for his parents.¹

The "Canção do exílio," of Gonçalves Dias, is the only poem of its kind among that writer's works. Composed in Lisbon, during a brief visit to Europe by the poet, this poem, with its melodic refrain: "Minha terra tem palmeiras,/ Onde canta o Sabiá," is known to, and has lodged in the memory of, well-nigh every person

⁷ *The Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, Tome VIII (La Rochelle), Paris, Plon, 1889, lists four mss. pertaining to Surgères and his family: 453, Fol. 145 (p. 247); 638, Fol. 13, Fol. 15, Fol. 17, (p. 374)). The last item, a letter signed, "Surgères," dated "le 13 mars 1758," speaks only of military matters. For a list of the positions which Surgères held and his part in the campaign of 1742 against the Austrians, cf. the article on him in La Chenaye-Desbois et Badier, *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse*, Paris, Schlesinger, 1872, xvii.

¹ See, e. g., "Uma manhã no monte jura," "O dia de anno bom de 1835," "A dia 7 de setembro, em Pariz," "Adeos à Europa," and others.

who is at all familiar with Brazilian literature. It had some influence on other Romantic poets. Nevertheless, I believe that there are passages in this poem which are quite reminiscent of Dias' predecessor, Gonçalves de Magalhães. The opening quatrain: "Minha terra tem palmeiras, / Onde canta o Sabiá; / As aves, que aqui gorjeião, / Não gorjeião como lá," calls to mind poetic terminology employed by Magalhães, who earlier and in a similar fashion, referred to palm-trees of his native land, the singing of the sabiá bird, and used the verb form, "gorjeia." Magalhães' "Porque estou triste?" begins: "Emquanto a sabiá doce gorjeia, / Gemem na praia as merencórias ondas." Later in the same poem he remembers that "Eleva-se a palmeira sumptuosa, / E desdobra nos ares verdes leques." Again, in "A dia 7 de setembro, em Pariz," he speaks of: "Em tempo mais feliz, em qu'eu cantava / Das palmeiras à sombra os patrios feitos," and bewails the fact that, in Paris: "O mimoso colibre não adeja, / Nem longe do seu ninho o canto exhala / O sabiá canoro." The lines in the fourth stanza of Gonçalves Dias' poem: "Minha terra tem primores, / Que taes não encontro eu cá; / Em scismar—sózinho, á noite— / Mais prazer encontro eu lá," may be evocative of Magalhães' "O genio e a música," wherein he laments: "Longe da Patria o viajor saudoso / Bem raras vezes o prazer encontra." And yet again, the opening lines of the final stanza of the "Canção do exílio": "Não permita Deos que eu morra, / Sem que eu volte para lá," resembles the lines in Magalhães' "A tempestade": "Hei de eu morrer, oh Patria, / Sem que um suspiro teu sequer mereça?" and in "Uma noite no Colisêo": "Não mais vel-a!—Morrer tão longe della."

There is no slavish imitation of Gonçalves de Magalhães on the part of Gonçalves Dias. Nevertheless, that the latter was familiar with the other's poetic production, and that there is in the "Canção do exílio" an evocation of the former's expression of "saudade," appears to me to be evident.

Casimiro de Abreu, who was forced to live in Europe for a considerable period of time, has been called "o mais exquisito cantor da saudade na velha poesia brasileira."² In deliberate imitation of Gonçalves Dias, he designated the group of poems written on foreign soil and contained in his "Primaveras," as "Canções do

² Ronald de Carvalho, *Pequena história da literatura brasileira*, 6a ed., Rio de Janeiro, 1937, p. 234.

exílio." In the first of these selections, entitled "Exílio," there is imitation of Dias in the line: "Meus amores ficam lá." It is in "Minha terra," however, that the imitation is most open and obvious, to the extent of quoting the first two lines of Dias' "Canção do exílio." The entire poem constitutes a paraphrase, albeit an excellent one, of the work written by Gonçalves Dias.

Abreu, despite his undisputed indebtedness to Gonçalves Dias, also betrays an awareness of the poetry of Gonçalves de Magalhães. In "Exílio," one is reminded of the title of Magalhães' volume, *Suspiros poéticos e saudades*, by the lines: "Onde canta nos retiros / Seus suspiros, / Suspiros o sabiá!" and of the intense patriotism of Magalhães in the line: "Quero a patria, o meu paiz." In "Minha terra," the lines: "Quiz cantar a minha terra, / Mas não pôde mais a lyra" bring to mind Magalhães' "A minha lyra": "Perdêo então minha lyra / Sua voz harmoniosa." The strong feeling of family unity on the part of Magalhães may be evoked in Abreu's "Jurity": "Eu definho, chorando, noite e dia, / Saudades do meu lar."

Despite the fact that José Veríssimo states that, in Alvares de Azevedo's "Na minha terra," there are perceived "reminiscências da 'Canção do Exílio' de Gonçalves Dias,"³ I have found no evidence to support this statement. The poem appears to me to resemble much more closely one by Casimiro de Abreu, entitled "O meu lar."⁴

HUBERT E. MATE

University of Alabama

CHAUCER'S SIR GAWAIN AND THE OFR. ROMAN DE LA ROSE

In "Gawain: his Reputation, his Courtesy and his Appearance in Chaucer's *Squire's Tale*," *Mediaeval Studies*, ix (Toronto, 1947), 189-234, a paper remarkable for its wealth of material, B. J. Whiting must have assembled almost everything there is to be known

³ *História da literatura brasileira*, Rio de Janeiro, 1916, p. 301.

⁴ This poem by Abreu appears in the excellent anthology, edited by Manuel Bandeira, *Antologia dos poetas brasileiros de fase romântica*, 2a ed., Rio de Janeiro, 1940, p. 237, with the erroneous title, "Canção do exílio." See Casimiro de Abreu, *As primaveras*, Lisboa, 1883, p. 89.

about Sir Gawain as the latter appears in medieval romance. At the end of the paper (pp. 230-34) Whiting restrainedly suggests that Chaucer may have introduced the reference to Gawain and his traditional courtesy in the *Squire's Tale* (CT F 95-97) under the general inspiration of the alliterative romance *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. This may be the case, and yet I wonder whether so passing and casual a reference to Gawain need be sought much farther afield than the OFr *Roman de la Rose*, ll. 2209-10, where Gawain is contrasted to Kay:

Tant con Gauvains, li bien apris,
Par sa cortoisie ot de pris.¹

A significant reason for looking to the *Roman* as the source of Chaucer's allusion is that, quite apart from a somewhat uncertain connection with it as a translator, he evidently knew the poem well and tapped it often. Indeed, a little later in the same poem (*Sq. T.*, l. 254) he draws on it for information about glass-making.² In his note to l. 95 Robinson suggests that Chaucer's background lies in a general knowledge of Arthurian romance, but this may, I think, be crediting Chaucer with more knowledge than he may actually have possessed. That he cared little for the matter of Britain seems clear from the insignificant use he made of it,³ hence, without implying anything like an abysmal ignorance of the subject, I see no reason to believe that he was widely read in it. (The same may, indeed, be said of his interest in the matter of France.) Chaucer is very decidedly what one would today call a "classics man," as witnessed by the extensive use he makes of stories looking back directly or indirectly to classical antiquity.

It is, to be sure, perhaps somehow unsatisfying to think that

¹ Ed. Ernest Langlois, II (Paris, 1920), 108. This passage is noted in passing by Whiting, *art. cit.*, pp. 193, n. 6, and 223 and n. 308, but not, I think, brought into connection with Chaucer. The corresponding English:

As fer as Gaweyn, the worthy,
Was praised for his curtesy

appears as ll. 2209-10 of the ME *Romaunt of the Rose*, in the B-fragment, probably by some imitator of Chaucer. See F. N. Robinson ed., *The Works of Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 664.

² See Robinson, *ed. cit.*, p. 824, note *ad loc.*

³ Cp. Whiting, *art. cit.*, pp. 193-94 and n. 8; also 194, n. 7, on the tradition of Gawain's presence in "Fairye."

Chaucer should not have known what most moderns view as the greatest and best of ME Arthurian romances, yet it seems to me doubtful if *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* ever circulated much outside the area in which it was written. For one thing, it is hard not to think that it would have made difficult reading for a Londoner of Chaucer's day. On this last point one cannot be positive, though something may probably be inferred from the difficulty it offers modern readers who can handle Chaucer's language with real ease.

By and large I prefer to see in "Gawayn, with his olde curteisye" a reflex of the *Roman de la Rose*, with "olde" in the sense "good old-fashioned," hence "elegant," i. e., more elegant than the manners prevailing among the younger generation in Chaucer's London.

F. P. MAGOUN, JR.

Harvard University

MONTAIGNE'S MISINTERPRETATION OF A GREEK CITATION

The question as to whether Montaigne had a thorough or a superficial knowledge of Greek has frequently been discussed by renaissance scholars.¹ It is quite probable that he knew more Greek than his statements would lead us to believe. We may attribute his modesty to a desire to avoid pedantry and to the standards of his time when a little Greek, like Shakespeare's "small Latin and

¹ Jean Plattard, *Montaigne et son temps* (Paris, 1933), p. 150, claimed that Montaigne's knowledge of Greek was very meagre when he left school and was not improved later. Pierre Moreau, *Montaigne, L'Homme et l'œuvre* (Paris, 1939), p. 61 and Hugo Friedrich, *Montaigne* (Bern, 1949), p. 62, assert that Montaigne's only knowledge of Greek authors was through French and Latin translations. Paul Porteau, *Montaigne et la vie pédagogique de son temps* (Paris, 1935), p. 287, is the only scholar who maintains that Montaigne's knowledge was so extensive that when he confesses to possessing only an average acquaintance with Greek, he really means that he cannot read Pindar without a dictionary. Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition* (New York, 1949), p. 616, and Börje Knös, "Les Citations grecques de Montaigne" (*Eranos*, Vol. XLIV, 1946), p. 469, concede to Montaigne some familiarity with Greek.

less Greek" would seem considerable if measured by modern criteria. Montaigne had no difficulty translating the citations he used even when the anthologies from which he borrowed them were unaccompanied by Latin translations.²

In the *Apologie de Raymond Sebond* (Essais, II, 12, Villey ed., II, p. 224) Montaigne quotes a one line passage from the *Ajax* of Sophocles (v. 554):³ "ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἡδιστος βίος" which he translates: "il y a beaucoup de commodité à n'estre pas si advisé." As Villey and Knös point out, Montaigne probably borrowed this quotation from Erasmus who also gives the following line, "τὸ μὴ φρονεῖν γὰρ κάρτ' ἀνώδυνον κακόν," and translates both lines as follows: "Suavissima hic est vita, si sapias nihil. Nam sapere nil, doloris expers est malum." (Chil. II, Cent 10, adag. 81). Jebb considers the second line to be a marginal gloss which was later interpolated in the text, for Stobaeus omits it and quotes the next line instead (v. 555):⁴ "ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθης." Since ten of Montaigne's forty-one citations come from Stobaeus, it seems strange that he should not have noticed the different meaning which the line has in its proper context. Jebb translates verses 554-557: "Yea, life is sweetest before the feelings are awake, [for lack of feeling is a painless ill,]—until one learns to know joy or pain. But when thou shalt come unto that knowledge, then must thou see to prove among thy father's foes of what mettle and what sire thou art." It is quite apparent that Montaigne has done violence to the text of Sophocles by claiming that ignorance in adults is praiseworthy when the Greek dramatist was merely paying tribute to the innocence of childhood, the most delightful period of life, because children have yet to experience the sorrows of maturity.

We may conclude that Montaigne sometimes used classical citations rather carelessly and that he relied too heavily on Latin translations. Yet the accuracy with which he translated Greek quotations when the Latin was unavailable and the confidence which he displayed in the accurate scholarship of Amyot would argue that his knowledge of Greek was more extensive than has

² Börje Knös, *op. cit.*, p. 482.

³ Edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb (Cambridge, 1907).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

been commonly supposed. His occasional free translations conform to current renaissance theories.⁵

LINTON C. STEVENS

University of Alabama

AN EARLY AMERICAN EXAMPLE OF FRENCH POETRY

Possibly the earliest example of French poetry written within what is now the geographical limits of the United States is preserved in a footnote in David Ramsay's ¹ *History of South Carolina from its First Settlement in 1670 to the Year 1808* (Charleston, S. C., 1809). To his account of the attack upon Charleston by a combined French and Spanish fleet under Captain Le Feboure in August, 1706,² an operation carried out in connection with Queen Anne's War, Ramsay appended the following note:

This repelled invasion was ridiculed in a humorous burlesque poem written above one hundred years ago in french, by one of the garrison, probably a french refugee. The poet makes the Governor, in his answer to the invaders, requiring an immediate surrender of the town and country, to say as follows:

Que s'ils attaquoient nôtre camp,
Ils y trouveroient bien mille hommes,
Qui ne se battoient pas de pommes,
Outre cinq cens Refugiés
Que la France a repudiés,
Et réduits presque à l'Indigence,
Qui ne respiroient que vengeance
Ce qu'on leur feroit éprouver,
S'ils ozoient nous venir trouver.³

⁵ See the practice of Sébillet according to Marie Delcourt, "Etude sur les traductions des tragiques grecs et latins en France depuis la renaissance," *Académie royale de Belgique*, t. XIX, fasc. 4, 1925. See also Paul Herbert Larwill, *La théorie de la traduction au début de la renaissance* (Munich, 1934), p. 33.

¹ For a biographical sketch of Ramsay, see R. L. Meriwether's article in the *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1935), xv, 338-39.

² Edward McCrady, *South Carolina under the Proprietary Government* (New York, 1901), pp. 394-401.

³ David Ramsay, *History of South Carolina from its First Settlement in 1670 to the Year 1808* (Charleston, S. C., 1809), I, 135-36.

Between 1670 and 1688, French Huguenots in large numbers settled in South Carolina where they constituted an important cultural and linguistic group for several generations.⁴ It is a matter of record that a French company of sixty men under the command of a Captain Longbois marched sixty miles to Charleston from the Huguenot settlement of South Santee to repel the threatened invasion.⁵ Thus, while Ramsey is vague about the source of this fragment of verse, circumstantial evidence is in favor of the authenticity of his remarks. There was definitely a large group of French speaking colonists in and about Charleston capable of appreciating a literary production of this kind, especially when the sentiments expressed were so unanimously and emphatically felt.

Charleston as an early center of French culture has been neglected in spite of the fact that this city supported both a French theater⁶ and a French language newspaper⁷ in the late eighteenth century. It is not surprising that what is probably the earliest example of French poetry written by an "American" in an "American" setting and about an "American" subject should have its origin here.

HENNIG COHEN

University of South Carolina

A NOTE ON POUND'S "PAPYRUS"

Ezra Pound's poem

PAPYRUS
Spring . . .
Too long . . .
Gongula . . .

has occasioned criticisms, in the language of *Finnegans Wake*, "merciless as wonderful."¹ "Gongula," of course, refers to Gon-

⁴ See Arthur Hirsch, *The Huguenots of Colonial South Carolina* (Durham, N. C., 1928).

⁵ Mrs. St. Julien Ravenel, *Charleston, the Place and the People* (New York, 1906), p. 50.

⁶ Edward Seeber, "The French Theater in Charleston in the Eighteenth Century," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XLII, 1-7.

⁷ George P. Winship, "French Newspapers in the United States, 1790-1800," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, XIII, 132.

¹ The poem was first published in 1916 in Pound's *Lustra* (Elkin Mathews,

gyla of Colophon, Γογγύλα Κολοφωνία;² the name of this disciple of Sappho's is to be seen on one of the empty marble seats of Alma-Tadema's "Sappho" in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore.³ The poem itself may be technically considered as an attempted translation of three out of the sixteen extant lines of a seventh-century fragment of Sappho (Berliner Klassikertexte P 9722.4), which reads:⁴

του[.
 ἦρ' ἀ[.
 δῆρα τῶ[.
 Γογγύλα τ[. . . .
 κτλ

It may be disputed whether ἦρ' (ῆρα) is a noun (ἦρ = ἔαρ, *ver*) ; all Sappho scholars seem to take it as a verb, Lobel reading it even as ἦρ'. Meanwhile it is interesting to note that Edmonds gives

London). For its criticism see Laura Riding and Robert Graves, *A Survey of Modernist Poetry* (London, 1927), 218-219; Glenn Hughes, *Imagism and the Imagists* (California, 1931), 123-124; Earl Daniels, *The Art of Reading Poetry* (N. Y., 1941), 9; Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition* (N. Y. and London, 1949), 517.

² See Suidas, conveniently quoted in J. M. Edmonds, *Lyra graeca* 1, 146 (Loeb series, 1922).

³ See *The Greek Tradition, an Exhibition Sponsored Jointly by the Baltimore Museum of Art and the Walters Art Gallery from May 15 through June 25, 1939*, 33.

⁴ The fragment was first published by W. Schubart in *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Jahrg. 1902, Erster Halbband 202-203; in 1907 Schubart published a revised version of the text in *Berliner Klassikertexte*, Heft v, zweite Hälfte 14-15. In 1909 J. M. Edmonds published the fragment first in *The Classical Review* 23, 156, and then in *The New Fragments of Alcaeus, Sappho and Corinna* (London, 1909) 14. On the assumption that Ezra Pound based his "translation" on the last-mentioned text, I have reproduced it here.

In 1916 Edmonds published a slightly revised text in *The Classical Review* 30, 130; the text in his *Lyra graeca* (see note 2) 1, 244 is thoroughly revised and radically reconstructed. His final text as published in *Sappho Revocata* (London, 1928) 43 reverts to his earlier, more conservative, reading.

The poem is also given in Edgar Lobel, ΣΑΠΦΟΥΣ ΜΕΛΗ (Oxford, 1925) 44; M. M. Miller and D. M. Robinson, *The Songs of Sappho* (N. Y., 1925) 285; Théodore Reinach and Aimé Puech, *Alcée/Sappho* (Budé series; Paris, 1937) 266.

several variant versions of the poem and that C. R. Haines abstains from translating it on the ground that "so much is fragmentary and uncertain."⁵ Doctors disagreeing, the poet may have a fling at the thing.

ACHILLES FANG

Cambridge, Mass.

REVIEWS

Goethes Weg zur Humanität. By HANS M. WOLFF. Bern: A. Francke, 1951. Pp. 268.

Although the author calls it a first sequel to his *Die Weltanschauung der deutschen Aufklärung* (1949), it may be doubted that a monograph on the "geistige Entwicklung" (p. 5) of one writer, however outstanding, can suitably continue a large historical discussion. Since no attempt, explicit or implicit, is made to indicate the context of eighteenth-century German thought within which the historical significance of Goethean "Humanität" alone could be demonstrated, *Goethes Weg zur Humanität* is only a critico-biographical study. It purports to trace Goethe's ethical development from the time of the writing of *Götz* to that of the composition of *Römische Elegien*, but inasmuch as its general discussion ("Vom Sturm und Drang zur Humanität," pp. 117-252) to all intents and purposes ends with 1786, it challenges comparison not only with treatments of the same theme in the larger general studies of Goethe, but also with Loiseau's classic monograph *L'Évolution morale de Goethe (terminus ad quem also 1786)*. Original as are Wolff's conclusions, novel as are the hypothetical data ("Biographische Voraussetzungen"—I. Teil: pp. 15-113) which he uses in tracing Goethe's "geistige Entwicklung" from 1771—for he indiscriminately equates *Geschichte Gottfriedens* and *Götz*—to 1790, his "essai de biographie intérieure" (to use the subtitle of A. Fuchs' thoughtful and sensitive *Goethe: Un Homme face à la vie*) is less lucid and less persuasive than any of the "standard" conservative interpretations of Goethe's development during the critical years covered. For in *Goethes Weg zur Humanität* the evidence of Goethe's correspondence is often cavalierly disregarded, often wilfully misinterpreted—in part because the author, prone to read Goethe's poetic works simply as autobiographical evidence, forgets their objective component (elements demanded by the aesthe-

⁵ *Sappho* (Broadway Translations) 99-100.

tic medium or derived from literary tradition and other impersonal sources). And even poetic "evidence" is sometimes strangely neglected: while 27 pages are devoted to *Iphigenie*, neither "Von deutscher Baukunst" nor "Auf Miedings Tod" is mentioned at any point in Wolff's general discussion, and Goethe is once referred to as "Dichter . . . der 'Geheimnisse,'" although that work is never actually discussed.

The eclectic adduction of evidence is undoubtedly the most obvious weakness of Wolff's interpretation of Goethe's moral development. Perfectly explicable, since the author is anxious to demonstrate the revolutionary importance of "new" biographical data offered in the first part of his book, it is nevertheless unpardonable in what purports to be a scholarly and objective study. For whether or not Wolff's biographical hypotheses are valid, they cannot contribute anything new to the picture of "Goethes Weg zur Humanität;" based as they are—they are reconstructions of an "Ur-Theatralische Sendung," an "Ur-Tasso," an "Ur-Gretchenragödie" and an "Ur-Egmont" all dating from 1773—on the very evidence used by his predecessors in their accounts of Goethe's moral evolution, they are a most unsatisfactory and completely insufficient substitute for incontrovertible evidence when that evidence is actually available. Equally disturbing shortcomings, however, are the failure to define terms and the inability to appreciate those implications of evidence that limit or even contradict generalizations in support of which it has been adduced. For example: Storm and Stress, like "Humanität," is never defined, with the result that it is meaningless to characterize a 1771 *Götz* as a work written "im Stil des Sturm und Drang" (Is there already a Storm-and-Stress style or, if not, does this one work create it?), while to discover in this play an unqualified affirmation of "die Freiheit des Genies" is surely to ignore that Adelheid's still unattenuated rôle in *Geschichte Gottriedens* is a powerful dramatic statement of the insufficiency of a purely subjective "Geniemoral" (ethical naturalism). Given such multiple confusion, it is not surprising that Wolff soon hails "Wanderers Sturmlied" as a first symptom of a turning away from Storm-and-Stress morality and detects in it, as he might otherwise, not a "Werther motif" (opposition of Poet to Peasant) irreconcilable with the fact that the hero of Goethe's novel is not presented as a would-be writer.

If *Goethes Weg zur Humanität* is unpersuasive as a biographical study, it is ultimately because on too many occasions its author reveals literary-critical incompetence of the sort just exemplified. For the same reason, its discussions of individual works by Goethe—"Urfaust," *Werther*, *Iphigenie* and some other texts are analyzed in considerable detail—fail to redeem any larger part of the whole. An analysis which disjoins from *Urfaust* a *Gretchenragödie* that "ganz dem Problem der Geniemoral gewidmet sein sollte" is un-

convincing when its author, by explaining that "Anmutige Gegend" will represent "die Tröstung und Heilung des Schuldigen [Faust] durch überirdische Gewalten," reveals that he cannot distinguish poetic symbolism from a literal supernaturalism completely alien to the humanistic spirit of *Faust*. So anxious is Wolff to demonstrate the plausibility of his *Gretchentragödie* thesis that he explains away the rôle of magic in it ("Nacht. Offen Feld" a late interpolation; Mephisto simply a thieving companion) without even wondering why one Mephisto should be performing the bidding of one Faust in a supposedly unmagical drama. Similarly, an interpretation of *Werther* as a work whose hero is "von wärmster Menschenliebe beseelt" and an exemplary exponent of the principle of *laede neminem* leaves one unpersuaded of the general reliability of the critic who can be insensitive to Werther's deliberate rudeness to Albert and others, to his sadistic treatment of Lotte.

Particularly unhappy is Wolff's thesis that with *Iphigenie* and "Grenzen der Menschheit" Goethe finds his way back to the Christian "Gott des Zornes und der Prädestination"—a thesis which he supports by explaining "Das Lied der Parzen" as Iphigenie's return to the faith of her fathers. Since a careful reading of the scene in which the song occurs indicates that its picture of the gods is the primitive brutal one from whose pernicious influence she wants to free herself when she cries "Olympier . . . Rettet mich, / Und rettet euer Bild in meiner Seele!" Wolff's insufficiency as a critic actually undoes what he attempts as a biographer. And conversely, as a biographer anxious to fit all data into a rigid scheme, he is forced into critical absurdity: to assert that "Der edle Mensch sei hilfreich und gut!" is a "Gemeinplatz" unless it means "Freie Entfaltung aller schöpferischen Fähigkeiten, und zwar in rein individueller Weise je nach den Gaben und Neigungen des einzelnen, ist die Pflicht und das Vorrecht des edlen Menschen"

is to ignore that tautology and poetic effectiveness are perfectly compatible (Keats' "Beauty is truth, truth beauty" in the Grecian urn ode could perhaps illustrate this).

STUART ATKINS

Harvard University

L'oeuvre poétique et la pensée religieuse de Hölderlin. By ERNEST TONNELAT. Paris: Didier, 1950. Pp. 368.

Professor Tonnelat's book is clearly designed to give the French student of literature an essential, readable and general introduction to Hölderlin's main works and ideas. This design has been carried out with precision and elegance. The method of presentation is not

strictly scholarly. One is surprised to find neither index nor bibliography at the end. There is nowhere a critical evaluation of the considerable body of German Hölderlin literature; indeed, Gundolf, Staiger, Beissner et al. are never mentioned. All considerations of *Textkritik*, revealing comparisons between the different versions of poems, Hölderlin's particular poetic procedure, the subtle interrelationships between life and work have been dismissed. The poet's work does not appear in its entirety, only in important major works in which his principal ideas can be shown with special clarity. And here the distribution is somewhat surprising: the youthful, hardly original, Hymns receive 60 pages of detailed discussion, the *Hyperion* 130 pages, *Empedocles* 55 pages; whereas the whole body of the late great hymns are much more briefly dealt with on 32 pages; the translations from the Greek are not included in the presentation.

The early Hymns lend themselves least well to M. Tonnelat's method of minute paraphrasing. They tend to lose their meaning and identity, until they sound almost silly. But here, as throughout the book, one admires the author's skilful and elegant translations into French of longer passages, which appear, at the bottom of the page, in the German original, faultlessly printed (so rare in French books!).

The most important part of the study, the discussion of the various versions of *Hyperion*, first introduces the conceptions of Fichte and Schiller, seen in opposition to each other, as they appear in the metrical fragment. Approaching the novel from its intellectual contents, so characteristic of the author's method, he unfolds a minute and far-reaching exposition of the first three letters of the novel, defining all the principal ideas. In the following chapter, *Hypérion et l'amitié*, the author again and again is aware of how, in such a paraphrase of a 'prose poem,' the lack of precise action, motivation, and first hand quotations of conversations becomes a real handicap for the interpreter who is bent on finding a traditional novel. The chapters *Hypérion et l'amour* and *Hypérion et le destin* continue the discussion which, almost without cross references, follows the movement of the plot. In the admirable interpretation (and translation) of the *Schicksalslied* the author demonstrates that this is not the formulation of despondency, but an "invitation to heroism." *Hypérion ermite* concludes the discussion of this book in which Tonnelat sees Hölderlin's major attempt at a renewal of religious values, a new kind of gospel the apostle of which the poet felt himself to be. Tonnelat formulates the essence of this religion thus: "l'adoration de la nature, personification du divin saisissable à nos sens en même temps qu'à notre esprit," and sees in it a mixture of pantheism and quietism with overtones of an *angoisse métaphysique*. In the chapter *Idylle et élégie* H.'s inability for the idyllic form in Goethe's sense (rather

briefly) and his mastery of the elegy (*Menon's Klagen*) are demonstrated. The next chapter interprets a few exemplary poems in which H. defines the role of the poet (especially *Wie wenn am Feiertage*) and two poems to show H.'s concern with Germany. The poet's longing for Greece and her ancient Gods form the contents of the next chapter, a detailed analysis of the *Archipelagus*. He stresses H.'s theory of *Wechseln und Werden* and so leads to the next chapter about *Brot und Wein* as the poet's chief exposé of his philosophy of religion. The elucidation of the different meanings of the word *Nacht* in H.'s works is quite masterful. *Die Wanderung* and *Germanien* serve as examples for H.'s view of Germany as the new Hellas. The reappearance of Christ in *Veröhnender der du* and *Der Einzige* makes up the discussion in the next chapter. *Patmos* and the Madonna hymn, in another chapter, help to define the figure of Christ as H. saw him: with these hymns his cosmogony becomes more concrete. His Greek Gods had been little more than idealistic abstractions. Only the second version of *Patmos* is used by Tonnelat. Surely, not only because he selects the great perfected works as examples, but also because he is only interested in the sane Hölderlin doing no lip service to a certain Hölderlin snobbery.—Tonnelat is old-fashioned, and, in a certain sense, has written the Hölderlin book which the 19th century never produced because it did not recognize the poet as a major figure. Hölderlin as a poet properly speaking (his use of metaphor, style, metrical forms); as a representative of his time (relationship to Friedrich Schlegel, Novalis); as heir of a poetic tradition and forerunner of much that came after him does not fully come forth from this finely worked analysis of his ideas.

WERNER VORDTRIEDE

University of Wisconsin

German Literature in British Magazines, 1750-1860. By W. ROLOFF, E. MIX and M. NICOLAI. Edited by B. Q. MORGAN and A. R. HOHLFELD. With a Historical Foreword by A. R. HOHLFELD. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949, Pp. 364. \$5.00.

The keynote of this comprehensive study is the Goethean ideal of *Weltliteratur*. It is a result of the labors which moulded and directed the scholarly interests of Wisconsin doctoral candidates during the long and fruitful careers of two distinguished authorities in the field of Anglo-German literary relations, A. R. Hohlfeld and B. Q. Morgan.

The "Foreword" records in personal retrospect the inception

and growth over a period of almost forty years of Mr. Hohlfeld's idea for the "Wisconsin Project on Anglo-German Literary Relations." The perception and interpretative skill of the narrator enable us to follow the impact of this idea, in all its scholarly and cultural ramifications, on America, on the state of Wisconsin and its University, and on the individual researchers. This introductory essay merits many readings.

The main part consists of two divisions. The first, "Historical Survey of the Entire Period," traces along large, general lines, but with due emphasis on important details, the inception and growth of the reception of German literature in British journals for the period under discussion. We see the short-lived enthusiasm from 1796-1800 when Bürger and especially Kotzebue put Lessing, Goethe and Schiller in the shade; the receding tide from 1801-1815; the period of ascendancy from 1816 to 1835 when the newly-founded English magazines and such interpreters as Carlyle, De Quincy, Gillies, and Taylor instilled in the English public an appreciation for German literature; and, finally, the period of strength and stability from 1836 to 1860 when Schiller's popularity was its zenith and Sara Austin was one of the important literary mediators. Throughout the discussion English, French, and German historical factors are recorded and integrated with the literary ones. The second part, "Magazine Criticism of Particular Groups and Authors," shows the same meticulous scholarship and evaluation which are manifest in the first. The editors have included trenchant summaries, have highlighted important details, and have effectively pruned and clarified the three bulky dissertation texts. A "Conclusion" briefly sums up the results.

The study concludes with a "List of Magazines" of which 164 were examined in part or in whole, a detailed "List of [5515] References" with accompanying tables and graphs, a "List of Authors" alphabetically arranged, and a "Bibliography" of 114 items. Although Hohlfeld-Morgan have reduced the Roloff-Mix-Nicolai theses by more than half, they have retained the essential information in their edited volume.

By seeing into print and giving uniformity to this triad of unpublished dissertations, the editors have completed an important facet in the many-sided structure of the Wisconsin Anglo-German undertaking. With the publication of this volume we now have a sound, scholarly, chronologically arranged series of eight studies on the reception accorded German literature in British journals from 1732-1914 and in American periodicals prior to 1846 and until 1914. Only two of them, Oswald's and Giessing's, are still in manuscript.

Statistical information gleaned from my "Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations in or Relating to Germanic Cultures Accepted by American Universities, 1873-1950" indicates that the

German department at the University of Wisconsin, under the almost forty-year headship of Professor Hohlfeld, has not only contributed the largest number of dissertations in the Anglo-German literary relations field, but at Wisconsin, where the Goethean ideal of "cultural mirroring" has dominated the department, there were more dissertations in all phases of comparative literature than in any of the seventy-eight American and Canadian universities included in my investigation.

These three Wisconsin dissertations, masterfully edited by Hohlfeld-Morgan, are a noteworthy contribution to the bi-centennial of Goethe's death and the centenary of the foundation of the University of Wisconsin. All who contributed intellectually, spiritually, and financially to this valuable memorial merit our gratitude.

RALPH P. ROSENBERG

Yeshiva University

La Dramaturgie classique en France. Par JACQUES SCHERER.
Paris: Nizet, s. d. [1951]. Pp. 488.

This large, thoughtful, and well-informed work puts M. Scherer in the first rank of French authorities on the dramatic literature of the seventeenth century. He has concerned himself, not with the esthetic value or the historical interest of the plays, but with the "métier de l'auteur dramatique." He has discussed various types of characters, the *nœud*, the *péripéties*, the *dénouement*, the unities, the *mise en scène*, the division into acts and scenes, the arrangement of material in accordance with the interest it arouses, the "tyrannie de la tirade," the *récit*, the monologue, the aside, *stances*, *sticomythie*, the exigences of *vraisemblance* and of *bien-séances*, etc. He divides the century into four parts, of which he considers it necessary to discuss only three: the archaic, the pre-classical (about 1630-50), the classical (to 1677), after which all the principles had been thoroughly established. He stresses especially the second group, finding the most important names in the century those of Mairet, Scudéry, Corneille, d'Aubignac, Scarron, and Molière.¹ He considers that their innovations, continued even into the present century, make "une étape décisive de l'évolution de la culture humaine" (p. 435).

Much of what he writes has been written before, but the study of French dramatic technique, as isolated from other considerations, has not hitherto been carried so far in France, not, at any rate,

¹ P. 429. He is speaking, of course, only of their contributions to dramatic technique. It seems to me that Tristan and Du Ryer, both of whom he frequently quotes, have as much claim to a place here as Scudéry.

since the time of the abbé d'Aubignac. Scherer's knowledge of bibliography is extensive and includes, as various recent French works do not, many references to American contributions. I am glad to see that he agrees with me in stressing the work of dramatists rather than that of critics. In fact he shows that the latter often followed the dramatists, noting, for instance, that the first critic to insist that the dénouement of the main plot should be influenced by that of all subordinate plots was Marmontel late in the eighteenth century. I note, too, that the evidence he submits (p. 140) in regard to the homosexuality of Clitandre makes still less tenable the contention of M. Charlier that the role was composed as a plea for Marillac; that his characterization (p. 242) of the *récit de Thérémène* disagrees with the suggestions of Mr. Lynes; and that his statement (p. 413) that "Corneille a tout simplement sacrifié à une mode fort répandue en donnant une grande place aux duels dans le *Cid*" underscores the ineptness of those who contend that Richelieu was displeased by them.

While I admire the patience and insight evidenced by Scherer in the composition of this book, I cannot say that it is faultless. I regret that he assigns to plays the date of publication rather than that of performance even if we are often not sure exactly when a play was first acted. I object to his use of the word *héros*, which at times means the *jeune premier*,² at times a mature man, or even a woman,³ and there are a number of slips:

P. 69, "Dans les *Galanteries du duc d'Ossonne* de Mairêt, Paulin a tué l'amant de sa femme Emilie, Camille," but he has only wounded him, as S. himself indicates on p. 401. P. 87, he admits that the change produced by the clemency of Augustus in *Cinna* is a *péripétie* in Aristotle's sense, but, as it constitutes the dénouement, or an important part of it, it is not a *péripétie* "au sens moderne"; yet on p. 126 he refers to the dénouement as beginning "quand survient la dernière *péripétie*." P. 115, the references to time in *Pyrame* are suggested by the subject and do not prove, as S. believes they do, that Théophile was consciously preserving the unity of time. P. 162, *la Belle Alphrède* and *la Belle Egyptienne* do not end in ballets. P. 165, Boyer should not be called the creator of the "machine" play, for Chapoton's *Orphée* preceded it, as did the Italian *Orfeo* produced in 1647 under the patronage of Mazarin. P. 171, the London theater called the Curtain did not have a curtain covering the stage; it was named after the lot on which it was built. Pp. 173, 266-8, it is unfortunate that S. overlooked the work of Jean Lemoine, which I quoted on p. 339 of *Sunset*; it gives documentary evidence to show that the reconstruction in 1647 of the Hôtel de Bourgogne made possible the use of a stage curtain and that in 1678 the width of the "jeu de paume du Marais" was 6 toises, of the Hôtel 7 toises—not "10 mètres." P. 175, as S. has been unable to discover the seven compartments to which I referred in describing the decoration of the *Prise de Marcilly*, I indicate them here: a fortress, a tower, a tent, a

² P. 20, "Le héros classique . . . est jeune."

³ P. 33, he lists as heroes Mithridate, Venceslas, and Agamemnon; on p. 46 he says that all of Racine's tragedies from *Andromaque* to *Phèdre* begin by a conversation "entre héros et confident," so that he must include among his heroes Acomat and Agrippine.

cave in woods, a hut, and, for the boat, on one side a "mer," on the other a "paccage." P. 188, when a queen refers to conquests "du Cambyse au Gange," S. comments, "Gilbert métamorphose sans vergogne le roi de Perse Cambyse en un fleuve," but the queen knew her ancient geography better than S., for there was in Media a stream called Cambyse, one mentioned by Ptolemy and Ammianus Marcellinus. P. 197, S. writes that prose plays are found only when "on se défie de ses talents de versificateur" or lacks time to write in verse, but neither explanation applies to prose plays by Scudéry and Du Ryer. P. 297, S. states that there were no *stances* in French tragedies of the last 35 years of the century, but I have indicated four tragedies of 1676-85 that contain them and have found several even in the eighteenth century. Pp. 321-2, "Dans la comédie franchement comique de Scarron ou de Molière, il n'y a guère de sentences"; I would suggest that he reread, for example, the role of Chrisalde or that of Martine. Pp. 375, misled by the abbé Bremond, S. states that Gaillard (1726-1806) was the first person to note Racine's blunder in regard to the "temple sacré formidable aux parjures" where Hippolyte and Aricie were to meet, but La Motte, who died in 1731, pointed this out⁴ and declared that it had been called to his attention by the marquis de Lassay (1652-1738).

H. C. LANCASTER

Les Idées de Balzac d'après la Comédie humaine. By GEOFFROY ATKINSON. Genève: Librairie Droz; Lille: Librairie Giard, 1949-1950. 5 vols. Pp. 110, 116, 116, 116, 136.

These five small volumes offer an orderly presentation of "les quelques milliers de réflexions, insérées par Balzac dans *La Comédie humaine*." (I, 9) For his subject, Mr. Atkinson did not feel called upon to discuss, from the aesthetic point of view, the inclusion in Balzac's novels of "cette masse de réflexions, de sermons, de harangues politiques, de défense des sciences occultes." (I, 9-10) Noting that the total volume of such reflexions exceeds that of Pascal's *Pensées* and La Rochefoucauld's *Maximes* together and is comparable, in extent, to La Bruyère's *Caractères* or even Montaigne's *Essais*, Mr. Atkinson "justifies" the task that he has undertaken as follows:

Il nous a semblé essentiel d'étudier cette masse de passages. Balzac tenait tellement à ces digressions qu'il s'interrompait constamment pour nous les faire lire. Et nous les considérerons ici comme si l'autre partie, la partie *roman*, n'existait pas. Si nous voulons savoir quelle sorte d'homme était Balzac, cette méthode s'impose, car ce sont là ses *Pensées*, ses *Essais*. (I, 10)

This justification is suggested again, briefly, at the end of the introduction:

... ceux qui n'ont pas eux-mêmes le temps de lire *La Comédie humaine* en entier nous pardonneront, peut-être, d'avoir essayé de rassembler les *Pensées* et les *Essais* du romancier. Quelle sorte d'homme était Balzac? Lisons-le pour le savoir. (I, 12)

⁴ *Œuvres*, IV, 307-8.

Starting from these assumptions, which I will consider below, Mr. Atkinson has set himself two basic rules for carrying out this study: (1) *ne citer que Balzac lui-même*, (2) *donner toujours les citations sur un même sujet par ordre chronologique*. (I, 9) The chronology, he explains in a footnote, is that of the "publication définitive," because: "Pour nous, il importe peu que l'auteur ait fait imprimer une idée pour la première fois à telle ou telle date. Mais il importe beaucoup qu'il n'ait pas rejeté une réflexion, écrite en 1835, à l'époque de la dernière révision de son texte." (I, 14, n. 1)

Admitting the arbitrary character of any system for classifying the "ideas" of a writer, Mr. Atkinson nevertheless was faced with the necessity for grouping his thousands of *fiches* in order to present them. Relying upon the Aristotelian principle of dividing man according to his faculties, he believes it possible to distinguish in Balzac—or in any man—a kind of trinity. Balzac "l'observateur" expresses ideas which Mr. Atkinson groups under the following chapter headings: La Psychologie, Les Passions, La Physiologie, Les Mœurs, L'Histoire. Balzac "le raisonneur logique" furnishes sections on: Les Théories métaphysiques et philosophiques, Les Sciences naturelles, L'Enfance et l'éducation, Les Influences du milieu, Les Théories politiques. Finally Balzac "l'homme émotif" provides Mr. Atkinson with seven more chapters: Les Sentiments religieux, Les Sciences occultes, La Morale, Les Sentiments politiques, Les Sentiments "romantiques," L'Esthétique, La Critique littéraire. In a brief conclusion, Mr. Atkinson refers again to the arbitrary element in any effort to "catalogue" Balzac's thought, and declares: "Il nous incombe, en terminant, de faire un effort de synthèse pour rétablir l'esprit et l'identité de l'homme Balzac, que nous avons analysé et même disséqué dans les chapitres précédents." (v, 114)

Readers who desire a kind of "dictionnaire raisonné" of Balzac's "ideas" will find here a methodical compilation of passages from the *Comédie humaine*, along with a running commentary relating them to the author's intellectual biography. It is impossible, in a brief review, to examine the details of the classification adopted or even the interpretations suggested by Mr. Atkinson's commentary. I was disturbed by the consistent tendency, in this commentary, to stress the cleavage between the "rational" and the "mystic" in Balzac and to disparage the "visionnaire passionné" noted by Baudelaire and recently recalled to our attention by Albert Béguin's admirable little work on *Balzac visionnaire*. But on the whole and within the limits he has set for himself, Mr. Atkinson has done a painstaking, thorough, accurate job, showing both "l'habitude des fiches" and skill in applying this method to a great mass of rather heterogeneous material.

With due respect for such scholarly virtues, I feel compelled, nevertheless, to express doubts about the validity of the assumptions

on which this study is based. In the passages cited above as well as throughout his work, Mr. Atkinson assumes that, as long as words clearly attributed to the characters are excluded, all of the "ideas" in the *Comédie humaine* may properly be abstracted from their context and considered as if "la partie roman" did not exist; he believes, furthermore, that these "ideas" may then be taken as *direct* expressions of the thoughts and opinions of "l'homme Balzac."

Probably no student of Balzac's works would deny that in many of the passages cited by Mr. Atkinson the author is interrupting his story to deliver disquisitions having no organic relationship with the novel in which they appear. Such passages, whatever other interest they may offer, represent momentary failures of the novelist. But can even the most clearly gratuitous of these passages be taken out of the fictional context in which Balzac placed them—however imperfectly—and treated exactly as if they were independent statements of his personal ideas? And what of the many other passages, which—even though their integration in the structure and texture of the novel may be poor—are nevertheless called forth by something in the subject of the novel? The irreducible fact that Balzac wrote *novels*, rather than "pensées" or "essais," cannot be ignored in any study based upon his works, whether we are interested in his mind and temperament or in his artistic achievements.

Certainly there is much to be learned about the mind which created the *Comédie humaine* from close textual analysis of the novels which make up that vast work. It seems a dangerous oversimplification of an extremely complex relationship, however, to assume that all of the "ideas" in the novels, irrespective of their fictional context, are direct expressions of the thought of Balzac the man. Balzac the novelist and Balzac the private citizen are not identical, and it is only by an act of inference—which needs to be examined in each instance—that the ideas expressed in the *Comédie humaine* by the novelist can be ascribed to the man.

All this is not to deny any value at all to studies of writers in which their creative works are used as a special kind of "documents" on their intellectual biography. Yet it must be emphasized, I believe, that no reliable insight into either the artist or his work can be obtained by ignoring the age-old problem of the distinction between art and life. As W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., has remarked, "no critic, from Plato to Allen Tate, seems able to persuade the others what the relation of poetry to the rest of life is." A definitive solution to that problem will doubtless forever remain an ideal, but at any rate, very few critics or philosophers of art have ever maintained that the relationship is as direct as studies like *Les Idées de Balzac d'après la Comédie humaine* tacitly assume.

CARLOS LYNES, JR.

University of Pennsylvania

Du temps perdu au temps retrouvé. Introduction à l'oeuvre de Marcel Proust. By GERMAINE BRÉE. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1950. Pp. 282. ("Etudes Françaises," 44^e cahier.)

Rather than an "introduction" to Proust's work, as the overly modest subtitle would have it, this book is in fact a profound and illuminating analysis of *A la recherche du temps perdu* by a critic with an altogether remarkable understanding of this novel as a work of art. Though she acknowledges in a general way her indebtedness to the numerous commentators on Proust and his work, Miss Brée bases her study chiefly on her own close reading of Proust's book and her admirable insight into its meanings. Equally remote from the Proustian faddists of some years ago and from the anti-Proustians of various persuasions, Miss Brée approaches Proust's masterpiece with the kind of lucid sympathy which has been conspicuously lacking in so much of the criticism of this author. The result is a book which I consider one of the very few really valuable critical aids for the serious reader of Proust. Coming as it does after André Maurois's biography and F. C. Green's detailed commentary, this new study fills a need which even those useful books had not fully met.

Though not unmindful of the obvious fact that *A la recherche du temps perdu* was the work of a human mind inseparable from a human body living in a certain time and place, Miss Brée rightly keeps her attention focussed on the novel itself as a work of art having its own independent existence. Sometimes known facts about the man are invoked to explain certain aspects of the novel and occasionally inferences about the man are drawn from things in the novel. But such observations are never confused with the fundamental job of criticism; they never lead to hasty conclusions in the realm of aesthetic values.

Miss Brée has the merit of perceiving that the rich meanings of Proust's novel are embodied in its unique structure; she has the still greater merit of following out this insight consistently, in all its implications. Thus she not only devotes an excellent chapter to the elucidation of the structure, but uses this analysis continually in other chapters to help bring out the meaning of separate details and of the novel as a whole. Drawing here upon her own previous articles, Miss Brée shows convincingly that, despite the extreme conclusions often drawn from Albert Feuillerat's important research in the history of the composition of Proust's novel, the basic order and unity of the work were not really destroyed by the tremendous expansion of the text after 1913. Her description of the novel as being composed of discontinuous but consecutive "blocks" of the narrator's experience makes it easier to grasp the dynamic form of the work and to understand how it could continue to grow right up

to the eve of Proust's death, but always in full accord with its inherent possibilities for expansion.

In her analysis of the structure, Miss Brée rejects the familiar notion that the novel is constructed in a kind of "circle" and that, at the end of *Le Temps retrouvé*, this circle is "closed" as the narrator prepares to write the very book which, at that moment, the reader is finishing. Miss Brée further insists that the narrator of the entire work up to the last chapter of *Le Temps retrouvé*, while already a middle-aged man, is not yet the man who has had the revelation of "la vraie vie" and of his own vocation as a writer which he recounts in the last chapter. While this hypothesis enables the critic to highlight the asymmetric form of the novel as a whole, along with the exciting shift in tone in the final chapter, I think a number of passages in the novel would support rather the accepted view that the narrator *as such* is the same man at the same stage of life throughout the work and that the reader is expected to infer, at the end, that the novel he has just read is the one this narrator is about to begin. The whole problem of "point of view" in *A la recherche du temps perdu* is extremely complex and, I think, somewhat inconsistent or ambiguous at times through the fault of Proust himself. Miss Brée's interpretation, even if one disagrees, is challenging; it reveals this fundamental ambiguity and suggests the need for a more minute study than has yet been made of this capital point. In any case, Miss Brée's emphasis on the differences between the whole long novel and the last chapter and on the victory expressed by the final chapter in juxtaposition with the long sections portraying "le temps perdu" loses none of its pertinency regardless of one's conclusion about the "point of view."

In the nine chapters of her book, Miss Brée has original and stimulating remarks to make about virtually every aspect of Proust's work. Such remarks, whether on details or on the principal themes of the novel, are always closely related to the critic's concern with *A la recherche du temps perdu* as a unique creative work which is significant only when grasped in its totality. This constant effort to use the results of analysis for a fuller synthesis, for a kind of organic criticism, comes out with particularly telling effect in Miss Brée's final chapter, "Proust romancier," which forms an effective conclusion to a first-rate study of the novel which many of us believe to be the greatest single literary achievement of our half-century.

CARLOS LYNES, JR.

University of Pennsylvania

The Last Romantics. By GRAHAM HOUGH. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950. Pp. xx + 284. \$3.00.

This is a study of the conceptions of art and its role in the world held by English thinkers from Ruskin to Yeats, written with a sense of their relevance to the present situation. It proceeds from the sound assumptions that the role of art has been diminishing during the period and that artists and theorists sympathetic to art have been developing, perhaps in compensation, higher and more esoteric claims for art. Mr. Hough is not a disinterested historian, but a critic intent on establishing the soundness of the high and esoteric claims, and in his last chapter he emerges as a fully committed disciple of Yeats. One is disappointed to find scarcely any reference to other synthetic works, although the material examined has often been used for purposes not unlike Mr. Hough's; the author wrote under great difficulties, at Singapore, when the never adequate libraries of Malaya had been damaged by the war.

The essay on Ruskin (chapter 1) is typical of the virtues in the book by its liveliness and freshness in approaching what Mr. Hough grimly calls "the dense jungle of Ruskin's works." There is an especially excellent treatment of Ruskin's power to sharpen and refine the senses of his readers, particularly in his earlier writings (*Modern Painters*, Vol. 1, is misdated 1847 instead of 1843, p. xv). The essay on the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood (chapter 2) is valuable for its clear account of the distinct and often contradictory theories held by the various brothers. In the essay on William Morris (chapter 3) there is a fine sense of the balance between Morris's ardent social theories and his dreamlike relaxed romances—an apostle is entitled to his recreations, and does not wish them to be exciting. Mr. Hough is aware of the great unlikeness between *Sigurd the Volsung* and the romances, but does not sufficiently explore the relevance of that great poem to Morris's social ideals. He may be right in saying that *News from Nowhere* presents a glorified suburbia; but the picture of life in the land of Elf the son of the Helper has much more brainwork behind it, and the treatment of the golden hoard is exactly what one would expect from Morris's social theories—all greed corrupts and absolute greed corrupts absolutely. In the essay on Pater (chapter 4) there is a study of Pater's development which is less successful because less balanced than the synthesis in Ruth Child's *The Aesthetic of Walter Pater*. The statement that the conclusion to *The Renaissance* (that book is mistakenly referred to the sixties, p. xvi) is "Pater's final solution" is unaccountable, for Mr. Hough is aware for instance of the importance that in later works Pater gave to the conception of community. About renunciation he is also mistaken: as early as the essay on Winckelmann Pater, who probably disliked the necessity for renunciation if one were to make the most of his potentialities, accepted that necessity;

and the development of Pater's style, not mentioned in the book, is an example of the application of renunciation. In the essay on the end of the century (chapter 5) there is a skilful gathering of poets, critics, and theorists of the decadence. The stature of Swinburne is minimized (from passing allusions it appears that the author is not sympathetic to Shelley—or indeed to Keats). One might think that anyone who had seen as much of the cruelty and anguish of our time as Mr. Hough, who passed years in a Japanese prison camp, would see that the algolagnia of Swinburne is not such an eccentric phenomenon as the Victorians supposed, and that a poet writing from that state is not cut off from the general ways of men. Probably it is because of his great devotion to Yeats that the end of the century poets seem so dwarflike to Mr. Hough.

The final chapter on Yeats is the study to which all the others lead; enriched as they are by many fine perceptions and by a tonic sense of the absurdity in much recent depreciation of the nineteenth century, they are in essence inquiries into the immediate backgrounds of Yeats. The stress in Mr. Hough's study of Yeats is philosophical, and psychological. Although we are asked to "rid ourselves of the vulgar superstition that the pronouncements *de rerum natura* of a bishop, a physicist, or a psychiatrist have necessarily more authority than those of a poet" (p. 258), the final recommendation for Yeats' view of man is that it is the same as Jung's. What was needed in this chapter was some convincing explanation why belief in magic and in the doings of the Society for Psychical Research should be taken as gravely as Yeats did. It is easy to accept and to admire the sympathetic interest in such matters that William James took: but Mr. Hough asks us to do much more—to conceive of a view of the world which depended to an extreme degree on belief in magic and psychic phenomena as the wisest (or at the very least on a parity with the wisest) formed in our century. There is a delightful epilogue in the form of an imaginary conversation between H. G. Wells and Yeats, in which, of course, Yeats has the *beau rôle*.

E. K. BROWN

University of Chicago

Walt Whitman—Poet of Science. By JOSEPH BEAVER. New York: King's Crown Press, 1951. Pp. xv + 178. \$2.75.

Whitman publicized again and again his theories on the inter-relationship between poetry and science. Still, even though from John Burroughs' time to the present an occasional cautious champion of Whitman as a poet of science has appeared, critics generally have given slight recognition to the poet's claims in this direction.

The prevailing view has been that his knowledge of science was vague and inaccurate and that he was too grounded in transcendentalism and romanticism to accept the full implications of science. This view is now challenged by Mr. Beaver, who with his knowledge of both Whitman and science has a fitness for treating the subject not hitherto equalled. The purpose of his book is "to show how Whitman faced boldly the problem of reconciling science with poetry and to evaluate the degree of success he achieved."

To ascertain the accuracy and extent of Whitman's knowledge of science, Mr. Beaver checks carefully, by using astronomical charts, nautical almanacs, and other technical sources of information, Whitman's numerous observations on fixed and unfixed celestial bodies. He proves these observations to be not, as has been claimed, "impressionistic ecstasy," but "pretty accurate descriptions of astronomical phenomena and planetary constellations that happened on those occasions" and to be based very probably on actual experience. Because of their accuracy, these observations may even be used occasionally to ascertain dates and other biographical facts.

Moreover, Whitman turned his information to poetic use, not through relying on "high-sounding, exotic names" but through "a functional interweaving of the modern scientific description of the universe and the principles and laws which govern the stars in their courses." The earth, for example, is practically always treated as a planet and given a subordinate place in the solar system, the sun as one of many suns, and the moon as a symbol of death, not as a conventional romantic body. And Whitman went beyond the solar system and used as poetic material astronomical laws and principles of the whole universe—sometimes too far beyond, concludes Mr. Beaver, for the ordinary lay reader.

More references are made by Whitman to astronomy than to all other nineteenth century sciences combined, but practically all are included. Generally, these are found to supply through their dominant principles controlling doctrines in *Leaves of Grass* and add to the number of scientific allusions.

The final measure of Whitman is taken by his responsiveness to evolution, for no "full-grown poet of science" could ignore or deny "the most important scientific advance of his times." In 1855, Whitman made evident his acceptance of "the development theory" and scattered through *Leaves of Grass* (also through his notes and prose) numerous later allusions to it. The contention that Whitman did not accept "the epoch-making implications of the doctrine" is refuted by a demonstration of his occasional pessimistic and "coldly materialistic" interpretations of the universe, and his inclusion in *Leaves of Grass* of such evolutionary hypotheses as the diversity and prodigality of nature in producing varieties, the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, as well as his "complete understanding of the vast periods of time involved" and

of "chronological sequence from the 'huge First Nothing' to the modern man." Mr. Beaver concedes that Whitman's "characteristic interpretation of scientific revelation was optimistic and aesthetic," and that the paradox of his materialism and his spiritualism raises a problem; nevertheless, he definitely puts Whitman's evolutionary thinking in the stream of evolution based on continuous uninterrupted development of physical phenomena, the stream postulated on scientific geological and astronomical principles accepted in his day. Here he differs sharply, as he admits, from J. W. Beach, who in his *The Concept of Nature in the Nineteenth Century English Poetry* contends that Whitman's evolution is transcendental or Hegelian; also from F. W. Connor (though he fails unaccountably and regrettably to mention him), who in his recent book, *Cosmic Optimism*, also concludes in a somewhat lengthy and provocative analysis that Whitman's evolution was non-scientific.

Other pertinent problems are given some attention, notably the source of Whitman's knowledge and his debt to and departure from Emerson. A brief summary can only suggest the scope and significance of the book. With due allowance for variant interpretations of many passages, the conclusion that the basic imagery of *Leaves of Grass* is scientific is well documented and is far reaching in its implications. The book should make it impossible for any serious scholar to ignore Whitman's just claims as a poet of science.

ALICE L. COOKE

The University of Texas

The American Writer and the European Tradition. Edited by MARGARET DENNY and WILLIAM H. GILMAN. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1950. Pp. xi + 192. \$2.75.

This is a collection of guest lectures delivered at the University of Rochester in 1948-9 in a series of conferences on our literary relations with Europe, roughly from the time when Sydney Smith asked, "In the four quarters of the globe who reads an American book?" to the time when *Gone With the Wind* answers, "Everybody." Louis B. Wright opens the volume with a description of the manifestations of the Renaissance ideal of the Christian gentleman in some colonial Americans. Theodore Hornberger analyses the mixture of foreign and native elements in some social and political concepts. R. E. Spiller follows the career of Franklin—representative of "an idealistic, a pragmatic, and a democratic people"—from provincial printer to world scientist. In masterly

surveys, Stanley T. Williams traces the contributions of nineteenth-century cosmopolitanism to our modern "literary culture," Henry Nash Smith—concluding with a perceptive analysis of Mark Twain's style—those of the emerging native tradition. Leon Howard, exploring the maze of the "Americanization of the European Heritage" in some major American writers from Poe to Whitman, finds a characteristic contrast between "the formal intellectual quality" of European and the "individual intellectual vigor" of American literature, and Willard Thorp contrasts the "realism" in the social thinking of Emerson, Thoreau, Melville, Whitman and their faith in democracy with Mark Twain's final "collapse into despair." With Clarence Gohdes's poker-faced survey of the consumption of American books in Europe, the emphasis on the nineteenth century comes to an end. In tracing the evolution of American naturalism from Norris to Dos Passos, Alfred Kazin finds Dreiser's superior power in his "creative pity," which—happily inviolate as well as uninformed by any "coherent philosophy"—made naturalism for him "the only way of addressing himself to life." The relation of ideas and literature, touched on by Kazin and others, is the explicit subject of Lionel Trilling's trenchant essay attributing the emotional weakness of some of our contemporary fiction to "the peculiar status" which we have given to "abstract thought" and which tends to lead to the death of ideas in ideology. Norman Holmes Pearson, finally, traces the influence which science, by redefining physical reality, has exercised on the search of modern poets for new modes of expression. And Harry Levin closes the series with an incisive and amusing examination of the recent reaction to our literature in Europe, which shows that, while the only common response of our foreign critics is "an inclination to see their problems reflected in our mirrors," their curious exaggerations have much to tell us about ourselves.

No one will be surprised that such variety of material and approach made the conferences at Rochester highly stimulating. What strikes the reader, however, is the extent to which the essays vary in the level of preparation and understanding they assume in him as well as in the amount of significant material which they contribute to the subject and the precision with which they focus on it. That 200 pages leave our cultural relations with Europe "insufficiently explored" is of course inevitable. Yet one regrets the omission of certain clearly defined segments of the complex subject—such as the fiction of social and political criticism of Europe with its recurrent contrast between "artificial" and "natural" aristocracy, or on the other hand, the exodus of young American writers to Europe after the Great War. Professor Williams suggests that one might trace "the subtly different focuses of the powerful influence of Europe" in many American writers, and such investigations of what Americans sought from Europe and what they rejected or

repudiated would, one feels, have contributed more to the coherent exploration of the subject than the concern with such leviathan questions as the editors confess to having posed in order to ensure "topical unity." It is a large and even a treacherous order that asks for a summation of the "heritage of European ideas in America" and of indigenous "ways of thinking" and "intellectual attitudes." Nothing makes this clearer than the semantic confusion and lax generalizations resulting from the editors' insistence on common conclusions: Divergences between the lecturers (*e. g.*, Professors Howard and Trilling) are ignored; Europe is characterized by "dedication to ideas," the "habit of abstract thinking"; America by "the habit of looking to Europe for inspiration, or thinking in the European manner" (which constitutes its "heritage"), and by "the habit of modifying European thought to accord with American circumstances" (which is its essential "quality"). Fortunately, the essays on which such conclusions are based are themselves less noncommittal. Yet some of them, too, seem tainted with the "ritual of showing respect for certain formulas," and the reader interested in our cultural relations with Europe will probably find satisfaction primarily in certain individual essays, perceptive and admirable as some of them are. For strangely, this is a book whose sum is less than some of its parts.

CHRISTOF WEGELIN

Princeton University

Nationalism and Language Reform in China. By JOHN DE FRANCIS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xi, 306. \$4.00.

In this book Mr. de Francis attempts to link the problem of Chinese script reform with that of recent political events in that country. His approach is polemic, and his case for the alphabetizing of Chinese writing is bound up with the platform of two divergent political parties which he calls the Integral Nationalists and the Federal Nationalists. Ch'en Kuo-fu, the leader of the Integral Nationalists, is quoted as saying, "China's ability to achieve unity is entirely dependent on having a unified written language." (It seems that the author does not trust the reader's memory, for this quotation is repeated three times, on pages 83, 222, and 251.) This conviction on the part of Ch'en Kuo-fu is interpreted to represent a drive for central control, uniformity, and "capitalist unity" of a "fiercely undemocratic" nature. The opposing party, led by Mao Tse-tung, believes that "unity and progress are to be sought more through literacy than through unification of the script" (p. 252). This attitude is in conformity with China's "New Democracy,"

which is supposed to lead to "political federalization" and "economic decentralization."

The question as to whether the Chinese language can be alphabetized can hardly be seriously asked by any linguist. Aside from the theoretical possibility, it is known that Annamite and other languages of the Sino-Tibetan group have been successfully treated in this way; and there exist several systems of Chinese alphabetization. Yet Mr. de Francis pays scant attention to these systems, and proceeds to become involved in an argument that is hardly to the purpose. To bolster his thesis that the Chinese language should be alphabetized, he proceeds to destroy the "monosyllabic myth" which has, according to him, stood in the way of the development of alphabetic writing. In so doing, Mr. de Francis puts forward a theory of syllables in which he seems to confuse the phonological concept of syllables and the morphological unit. Finally, he attempts to compare English and Chinese, and comes to the somewhat meaningless conclusion that "Chinese is at most a syllabic language as are all the other languages in the world" (p. 156). In spite of Mr. de Francis' argument, it is nonetheless true that the majority of morphological units in the Chinese language are monosyllabic; nor does the reform of the Chinese script require the destruction of such a "myth," as evidenced by the development of several successful systems.

The author's attempt to confuse the issue of linguistic reform with the conflicting policies of the right-wing Kuomintang and the Chinese Communists does not do justice to the various efforts at alphabetization that have been made, and presents an entirely one-sided picture of the development. It is probably true that the acceptance of any new system of writing in China depends on the decision of the government in power, but it seems doubtful that such a decision will be based on linguistic theory. And the author himself abandons this view with the closing words of the book: "The social, political, and military struggle raging in China is now deciding the fate of Chinese nationalism and with it the future of Chinese writing. The stage is being set for the most far-reaching cultural revolution in all Chinese history."

ILZA VEITH

The University of Chicago

Thoreau: The Quest and the Classics. By ETHEL SEYBOLD. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1951. Pp. xi, 146. \$3.00.

Everyone has known that Thoreau was the best linguist of the Concord group, and everyone has known that his knowledge of Greek and Latin classics was wide and that his abiding admiration of classical writers grew out of early and thorough knowledge of

their books. But until Miss Seybold's study we have not had such specific information about just what Thoreau read of the ancients and just where and how in his own writings he made use of his reading. Nor, until her book, had I suspected that his going to Walden Pond was "a conscious effort to realize the simplicity of Homeric life." I thought his going there was more closely related to romanticism and the industrial revolution than that.

It is at that point that the value and the overemphasis of this book merge. There is not the least doubt that the sureness and simplicity of the ancients was attractive to Thoreau; but there is grave doubt that even Homer warped him out of his own orbit. The value of Miss Seybold's book is in showing how great was his interest, how persistent and numerous his references, how wide his reading, and how varied his sources. It requires long appendices merely to index his thousands of quotations and allusions as they appear in his published works. A reading of the writings themselves would, of course, convince one that his classical debt was large. Miss Seybold's book is an itemized statement of the size of that debt.

Valuable as it may be to know the extent of Thoreau's debt, it is more valuable to know the credit side of the tally. Miss Seybold's best contribution is her evidence that Thoreau's days were bound together in a consistent "quest for transcendental reality, in an attempt to discover the secret of the universe." This quest idea is a real contribution to understanding Thoreau, not against the background of the ancients, but against the immediate background of his own time. He hinted at it often enough, saying that he hunted horse, hound, and turtle-dove and that he went to Walden Pond to seek the real meaning of life. In this book the quest idea is given the central focus it deserves. That focus is correct. What seems incorrect is projecting so clear an idea against the classics too exclusively.

This is a serious study, a dissertation replete with footnotes and appendices. Perhaps that is why it omits Thoreau's playful use of Greek epic in his mock heroic account of the battle of the ants on the pile of chips. One of Thoreau's charms as a writer, his ability to create a microcosm, comes close to Homer just there. Curiously also, the mock-epic quality of *A Week* as a little river Odyssey is omitted. Unfortunately, *A Week* (and the title is not *The Week*) is neglected in Miss Seybold's book in favor of the later *Walden* and the essays "Autumnal Tints," "Night and Moonlight," "Wild Apples," "Life Without Principle," and "Walking." A study of Thoreau and the classics is incomplete without full consideration of *A Week on the Concord and Merrimack Rivers*.

Thoreau did take Homer's *Iliad* with him to Walden Pond. But we must not forget that Walden Woods environed him there more than Homer absorbed him, and the railway engine across the pond reminded him daily of nineteenth century machines, and Concord

was an American commercial village only a mile away. These were his foreground at Walden. And a mosquito flying through his open house one morning buzzed the wrath of an Achilles and wandered away like a Ulysses of his own time, not Homer's.

RAYMOND ADAMS

The University of North Carolina

English Poetic Theory, 1825-1865. By ALBA H. WARREN, JR.
Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. vii + 243.
\$3.00.

Mr. Warren begins by saying, with considerable justice, that contemporary criticism has not been notably successful in its attempts to re-assess nineteenth century poetry; and he ascribes this failure in part to our ignorance of nineteenth century theories of poetry. We know a good deal about Romantic theory, something about the art for art's sake theory of the end of the century, but little about that of the middle years. The purpose of this book is to fill the gap. Undoubtedly the gap needs filling. We too often content ourselves with the vague assumption that Victorian beliefs about poetry were merely a moralised continuation of the Romantic ones, without serious enquiry into the particulars of critical theory. Here we are given the opportunity to repair the omission. After an introduction outlining the topics of poetic theory in this period, nine sections follow, devoted to the critical statements of nine authors—Newman, Keble, Mill, Carlyle, Leigh Hunt, Browning, Dallas, Arnold and Ruskin. These various doctrines are ably and clearly summarised, though there is perhaps a certain fortuitousness in their selection, and a certain lack of proportion in the space devoted to each. Leigh Hunt's *Essay in Answer to the Question 'What is Poetry'* seems a rather accidental intruder into this age; Keble gets as much space as Matthew Arnold; and A. S. Dallas (surely not a very weighty critic, either by his achievement or his influence?) gets more than either. It may be that poetic theory was not very vigorously pursued in this period after all, and any fish that came to the net had to be brought to market.

Mr. Warren works hard to find some guiding lines in this congeries of often unrelated statements. One he finds in the pervading influence of Coleridge; another in the strongly practical tone of Victorian criticism, the perpetual relation of poetry to morals and society; as he remarks, the early Victorians "had no real respect for contemplation." We hear little about poetic form: the criticism of the time "was ruled by the notion of poetry as an essence or utterance, and tended to ignore the claims of poetry as an art or craft." Of "practical criticism" in the modern sense there is re-

markably little; after reading these pages one is inclined to feel that there were only too many general statements about what poetry is or is not, any of which may or may not be true; since, however, they are little related either to consistent aesthetic principles or to the discussion of any particular poetry, they remain with us chiefly as detached nuggets of historical information. Mr. Warren seems at times to feel this; perhaps he could have found a principle of unity only by accepting the outlook of the Victorians themselves, and setting their poetic theory in a wider context of religious and social thought. But that would have been to write a different book. As it is, this one gives a useful outline of a neglected patch of literary history; and in addition shows a lively awareness of its relation to the critical questions of today.

GRAHAM HOUGH

Cambridge University, England

BRIEF MENTION

Browning's Essay on Chatterton. Edited by DONALD SMALLEY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948. Pp. xi, 194. \$3.50. In discovering the second known literary essay in prose by Browning, Professor Smalley has made a great contribution to scholarship. He deserves, and must have a lasting reputation among students of English literary history, and the heartiest congratulations of his colleagues. The Browning text fills but twenty-nine pages of the book. The external evidence—a firm attribution to Browning by a close friend who had no possible axe to grind—is not merely convincing, but quite irrefutable.

Browning's thesis is that Chatterton was merely a hoaxer, caught in a net of his own creations, and that his original intention was to confess his authorship of Rowley. Browning cites the lines beginning "Walpole, I had not thought" (which Chatterton was dissuaded by his sister from sending to Walpole), and it is my considered opinion that the poem does mean that he wished to do with *Ælle* what Walpole did with *Otranto*. Professor Smalley does not seem to realize that, however much Browning romanticized his hero, however much he whitewashed Chatterton, there is basically much that is acceptable in his interpretation of a complex and puzzling character. Browning, in brief, seems to me to have had more insight than his editor. The professor at one point speaks of Chatterton's "originals" as clever, but they never deceived any competent paleographer. And is it not at least possible Chatterton really began by supposing the Bristol antiquarians less foolish than they were? I believe Barrett was a willing dupe.

At page 156 and 157, the rare word *alliteratious* is misprinted *alliterations*. The editor seems not to have learned that the correct spelling of Chatterton's chief poem is not AELLA but AELLE. Although the passage quoted is not one that Skeat mutilated, the use of his edition of Chatterton (on the plan of Bentley's Milton, as bad as Skeat's Chaucer is good) should be avoided in advanced work on Chatterton.

T. O. MABBOTT

Hunter College, New York

Heroines in French Drama of the Romantic Period, 1828-1848. By GRACE PAULINE IHRIG. New York: King's Crown Press, 1950. Pp. 246. \$3.00. A careful study of heroines in about 160 plays, mainly of the time indicated, but including eighteenth-century tragedies and *dramas* as far back as *Zaire*.¹ She gives the characteristics of the romantic heroine and shows that she is represented by a much greater variety of characters than is usually supposed. She notes the manner in which historical women are dramatized, the putting of old heroines into new plays, the role of religion and of social reform, and contemporary criticisms of romantic heroines. In this last investigation she could have been helped by Dr. Pendell's work, *Victor Hugo's Acted Dramas and the Contemporary Press*.² Her study has been made with evident industry and objectivity. I would correct only a few statements. P. 18 she observes that "Virtue in the eighteenth century meant conformity of one's acts with one's natural emotions." This may be true of certain romantic souls, but the word is ordinarily used as at present; cf., for instance, the *Mercure* for January, 1786, p. 88, "immoler ses passions à sa vertu." It seems to me that we know too little about Doña Sol to call her an *ingénue* (p. 44). P. 212, Dr. Ihrig follows Biré in assuming that the *Lady of Lyons* was the source of *Ruy Blas*, a notion exploded by Lanson over thirty-five years ago.³ Had the Columbia University Press given this volume its "usual editorial and typographical attention," we should probably not have the misprints I have noted on pp. 7, 93, 106, 153, and 156.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

¹ In her search for sentimental origins it would have paid her to go back nine years more, to *Inès de Castro*.

² Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1947.

³ *RHL*, xxii, 392-401; cf. also my article in *MP*, xiv (1917), 641-646.

Willa Cather: A Critical Introduction. By DAVID DAICHES. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1951. Pp. vi + 193. \$2.75. Professor Daiches, in a brief preface, terms his book "a work of literary criticism and appreciation, not a work of philosophy or *Kulturgeschichte*." Disclaiming any specialized knowledge of American literature, he states that his chief concern has been an attempt to answer the question: "What do you think of the work of Willa Cather?" His "thoughts" on the subject, though in some instances disappointingly brief, will prove of value to student and "general" reader alike. Four of the seven chapters are devoted to a discussion of the novels in chronological order—ranging from the "literary exercise" of *Alexander's Bridge*, through the works dealing with "pioneer and connoisseur" which established her reputation, to the last and weak *Sapphira and the Slave Girl*. A single chapter deals with the short stories, and a "final estimate" attempts also to take note of Miss Cather's poetry and miscellaneous writings. In Professor Daiches' view, the later Cather failed because of an increasing disillusion with modern life and a nostalgia for the past which caused her to become "too self-consciously old-fashioned." Her chief virtues he summarizes by noting that, at their best, her novels are "civilized"—a term for which he asks wide implications. Though some of his plot summaries are perhaps overly detailed, thus necessarily curtailing his critical comments, Professor Daiches has nonetheless managed the first balanced and complete survey of the work of an American writer whose contributions to the craft of fiction may now begin to be fairly assessed.

JOSEPH V. RIDGELY

Baltimore, Md.

CORRESPONDENCE

LESSING'S RUMORED JOURNEY TO VIENNA IN 1748. In the May number of *MLN*, 1951, B. Q. Morgan suggests a reason why Lessing's journey to Vienna to visit the Lorenzin, if he made such a journey, resulted in a failure. No more plausible reason could be offered, but it is my purpose to consider the previous question: Did he go to Vienna or not?

Karl Lessing first referred to the rumor regarding the trip: "Viele erzählen zwar, er sei zuerst nach Wien der Schauspielerin Lorenzin nachgegangen, und von da nach Berlin gereiset. Allein das sind nur sinnreiche Mutmassungen, die eine Art müssiger Menschen seinem Charakter gemäss glaubte."¹ Despite these deprecating words of his brother, the rumor comes

¹ Karl G. Lessing, *G. E. Lessings Leben*, ed. O. F. Lachmann, Leipzig, Reclam, 1887; p. 49 f.

under discussion from time to time. Even the careful Danzel in the passage quoted by Morgan concludes with the suggestion that "etwas derartiges zu berichten wäre."

When one plans to visit Vienna or any other distant city two elements have to be taken into account: time and money. The visit to Vienna, if indeed it occurred, took place at some time between the 13th of August 1748, when Lessing matriculated at Wittenberg, and the sixth of December, when he was definitely in Berlin. Actually the span is somewhat shorter, for Lessing was seriously ill shortly after his arrival at Wittenberg. His illness was followed by a period of convalescence which was presumably not complete by the 13th of August and there has always been the suggestion that he may have arrived in Berlin somewhat earlier than the 6th of December. Within these twelve weeks or less occurred the visit to Vienna, if indeed it occurred at all.

Göring sums up Lessing's activities at Wittenberg about as follows:

Er begann dort sein Lustspiel *Der Misogyn* und die als Fragment zurückgelassenen Stücke *Weiber sind Weiber* und *Justin*. Er veranstaltete seine Gedichtsammlung *Kleinigkeiten* für den Verlag von Metzler in Stuttgart. Er schloss seine Tätigkeit mit einigen kleineren Gedichten und einem längeren Sendschreiben an Mylius in gereimten Alexandrinern ab, welches in *Naturforscher* erschien.²

It will be noted that little of this industry was immediately productive financially. We may add to the above that he may have attended some of the lectures at the University after his matriculation, though there is no evidence of this, and then we may inquire whether he had time enough left over to visit Vienna.

The shortest way from Wittenberg to Vienna by postroad at the time was by way of Leipzig, Dresden, and Prag, a distance of about eighty German miles. The first part of the journey as far as Prag was about fifty German miles. A fair rate of travel over this stretch, barring mishaps, which were frequent, would be five German miles a day or about ten days for the journey. From Prag to Vienna the roads were provided with metallic rails and the post wagon could proceed at the astonishing rate of fifteen miles or more per day. Thus the trip could be accomplished in two additional days, making a total of twelve. The return journey would avoid Leipzig and Wittenberg and the entire journey from Vienna to Berlin by way of Prag and Dresden might be accomplished in ten days.³

If Lessing had to spend twelve days on his outward journey and ten on the return he would probably plan to spend at least a week in the company of the Lorenzin and her troupe. On the whole his trip would have occupied about four out of the twelve weeks when Lessing was nominally in Wittenberg. This does not make the trip impossible, but it diminishes slightly its probability.

² Hugo Göring, *Lessings Leben*, Stuttgart, Cotta, 1884; p. 75.

³ W. H. Bruford, *Germany in the XVIII century*, Cambridge, 1935; p. 161 ff. See also the German road map of the eighteenth century at the end of the volume.

We may now consider the financial side of the question. Regarding the purse of no young man of nineteen during the autumn of 1748 are we better informed than as to Lessing's. Lessing's parents and relatives had sent him to Leipzig with means to pay all his sundry personal debts and with a stipendium sufficient for a semester at Leipzig. Then came the departure of fragments of the Neuberin troupe to Vienna, and Lessing was unwise enough to guarantee their debts until they should send him money out of their first earnings at Vienna. The money, as we know, failed to come, and Lessing took flight to Wittenberg. Oehlke says here:

Indessen entging er seinen Gläubigern nicht . . . So liess er denn alle Stipendien und fernere Ansprüche auf sie zur Abzahlung seiner Schulden zurück, löste sich aus dem Verhältnis zur Universität, verzichtete unausgesprochen zugleich auf die Unterstützung durch das Elternhaus und warf sich dem Schriftstellerleben in die Arme.⁴

In short in the words of his Chevalier de la Marlinière Lessing saw himself "vis-à-vis du rien." To be sure he held his parents to one promise, namely that of a new suit of clothes, without which, he said, he could not make the proper personal application for writing commissions in Berlin. It is pathetic to think of Lessing making the long and costly journey to Vienna and then having in shabby clothes to escort the beautiful Lorenzin through the stately streets of the Kaiserstadt.

As to the cost of travel in 1748 Bruford give no indications but he quotes Büsching, writing in 1762, as estimating the cost at 1 Thaler 12 Groschen per mile. The total distance of the journey described is about 150 German miles. The cost then would be about 180 Thaler, to which must be added the expense of living in Vienna and entertaining in not too niggardly a fashion a young actress.

The *affaire Lorenzin* is one of the few romantic episodes of the youth of Lessing with which the biographers have found it possible to regale us. A hasty secret journey to Vienna would be the suitable climax to the intermezzo. I hope that someone sometime will be able to prove that it was probable or at least possible, but at present I am not optimistic.

LAWRENCE MARSDEN PRICE

University of California

The Malone Society well known for its annual publication of carefully reproduced texts of Tudor and Stuart plays is anxious to extend its American membership. It has recently issued Chettle's *Tragedy of Hoffman* and Fletcher's *Demetrius and Enanthe*. Two additional volumes will be issued every year. The annual subscription is 30 s. There is an entrance fee of 30 s to new members for which previous publications to that amount are supplied. Applications for membership should be addressed to the secretary: Miss K. M. Lea, Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

⁴ Waldemar Oehlke, *Lessing und seine Zeit*, München, 1919; I, 92.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

Brown, Beatrice D., Heningham, Eleanor K., and Utley, Francis L.—Ninth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400. *New Haven, Conn.*: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences (Yale Univ. Press), 1951. Pp. 1769-1938. \$4.00.

Christen, Marcel.—Katherine Mansfield. *De la Nouvelle-Zélande à Fontainebleau*. *Niort*: Chiron, 1951. 108 pp.

De' Giorgi Contini Bonacossi, Elsa.—Shakespeare e l'attore. *Florence*: Electa, 1950. Pp. 26.

Dobrée, Bonamy.—Alexander Pope. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1952. Pp. 125. \$3.00.

Donner, H. W.—Två Kapitel Engelsk Grammatik. *Helsingfors*: Söderströms, 1951. Pp. 107.

Emde Boas, C. van.—Shakespeare's sonnetten en hun verband met de travestiedouble spelen. *Amsterdam*: Wereldbibliotheek, 1951. Pp. 528.

Fogle, French R.—A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1952. Pp. xviii + 236. \$3.25.

Frühlich, Jürg.—Der Indefinite Agens im Altenglischen. *Bern*: Francke, 1951. Pp. 145. (Swiss Studies in English, 25).

Graf, Emil.—Die Aufnahme der englischen und amerikanischen Literatur in der deutschen Schweiz von 1800-1830. *Zurich*: Juris-Verlag, 1951. Pp. 127. SFr. 7.50.

Greene, E. J. H.—T. S. Eliot et la France. *Paris*: Boivin, 1951. 248 pp. Fr. 900.

James, D. G.—The Dream of Learning. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1951. Pp. 126. \$2.50.

Lalou, René.—La Littérature anglaise des origines à nos jours. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1951. Pp. 136. Fr. 100.

Marlowe et Chapman.—Héro et Léandre. Etude critique, tr. et notes par J. B. Fort. *Paris*: Aubier, 1950. Pp. 208. Fr. 360.

Martin, Edwin T.—Thomas Jefferson: Scientist. *New York*: Henry Schuman, 1952. Pp. x + 289. \$4.00.

Mativa, Adrien.—Vita Nova. II. Du Beowulf à Chesterton. *Gembloux*: Duculot, n. d. Pp. xii + 242.

Praz, Mario.—Cronache letterarie anglosassoni. I. Cronache inglesi. *Rome*: Storia e letteratura, 1950. Pp. 300. L. 1200.

Sanna, Vittoria.—Il romanzo di Virginia Woolf. *Florence*: Marzocco, 1951, 297 pp. L. 950.

Trollope, Anthony.—The Letters of. Ed. Bradford A. Booth. *London*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1951. Pp. xxx + 519. \$8.00.

Young, T. D.—Jack London and the Era of Social Protest. Summary of Vanderbilt U. diss., 1950. Pp. 36.

GERMAN

Bangerter, Arnold.—Die Grenze der verbalen Pluralendungen im Schweizerdeutschen. *Frauenfeld*: Huber, 1951. xviii + 114 pp. SFr. 10.

Bocchino, Teresa.—Sensualismo e misticismo nella lirica di R. M. Rilke. *Reggio Calabria*: "Italia intellettuale," 1950. 46 pp.

Burger, Heinz Otto (ed.).—Annalen der deutschen Literatur. Eine Gemeinschaftsarbeit zahlreicher Fachgelehrter. 4. Lieferung (umfasst die Zeit von 1862-1945). *Stuttgart*: J. B. Metzler, 1952. Pp. 673-882. DM. 14.75.

Gryphius, Andreas.—Catharina von Georgien. Abdruck d. Ausg. v. 1663 mit d. Lesarten v. 1657 hrg. v. Willi Flemming. [Neudrucke dt. Literaturwerke Vol. 261-262.] *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1951. xiii + 107 pp. DM. 3.50.

Hofmiller, Josef.—Die Bücher und wir. *Zurich*: Verlag der Arche, 1951. 205 pp. SFr. 8.80.

Hoppe, Else.—Ricarda Huch. Weg, Persönlichkeit, Werk. *Stuttgart*: Riederer-Verlag, 1951. iv, 972 pp. DM. 27.50.

Kosch, Wilhelm.—Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon. Biographisches u. bibliographisches Handbuch. 14. Lieferung: Kaufmann—Kocher. *Bern*: Francke, 1952. Pp. 1233-1328. SFr. 7.20.

Lüthi, H. J.—Das deutsche Hamletbild seit Goethe. *Bern*: Haupt, 1951. 193 pp. SFr. 12.

Meier, Hugo.—Vom Wesen und Gebrauch der deutschen Sprache Mit einem Geleitw. von Karl Schmid. Hrg. von Heinz Appenzeller. *Zurich*: Energetica-Verlag, 1951. 72 pp. SFr. 4.

Olbrich, Wilhelm.—Der Romanführer. Der Inhalt der deutschen. Romane und Novellen vom Barock bis zum Naturalismus. *Stuttgart*: Hiersemann, 1951. iv, 362 pp.

Rehm, Walther.—Götterstille und Göttertrauer. Aufsätze zur deutsch-antiken Be-

gegnung. *Bern*: Francke, 1951. 365 pp. SFr. 19.50.

— Nachsommer. Zur Deutung von Stiftern Dichtung. *Bern*: Francke, 1951. 141 pp. SFr. 6.80.

Ritzer, Walter.—Rainer Maria Rilke Bibliographie. *Vienna*: Kerry, 1951, xvi, 328 pp. SFr. 24.

FRENCH

Beaumarchais.—Théâtre, éd. Ch. Beauquier. *Paris*: Lemerre, 1950. xix + 227 pp. Fr. 400.

Bond, O. F. (ed.).—Hier. An Anthology of French History. *Boston*: Heath, 1952. vi + 119 pp. \$.80.

Burnecque, J.-H.—Les Années d'apprentissage d'Alphonse Daudet. *Paris*: Nizet, 1951. 539 pp.

Cahen-Salvador, Georges.—Un grand humaniste: Peiresc, 1580-1637. *Paris*: Michel, 1951. 320 pp. Fr. 600.

Chateaubriand.—Lettres à Mme Récamier, éd. Maurice Levaillant. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1951. 571 pp. Fr. 1350.

Cladel, Judith.—Maitre et disciple: Charles Baudelaire et Léon Cladel. *Paris*: Corrêa, 1951. 127 pp. Fr. 290.

Delattre, André.—Répertoire chronologique des Lettres de Voltaire non recueillies dans les éditions de sa correspondance générale. *Chapel Hill*: U. of N. C., 1952. xii + 203 pp. (U. of N. C. Studies, 17.)

Drouet, Juliette.—Mille et une lettres d'amour à Victor Hugo, éd. Paul Souchon. *Paris*: Gallimard, 1951. 831 pp. Fr. 1250.

Evans, Henri.—Louis Lambert et la philosophie de Balzac. *Paris*: Corti, 1951. 267 pp. Fr. 420.

Fabre-Luce, A. et C. Dulong.—Un amour déchiffré: La Rochefoucauld et Mme de La Fayette. *Paris*: Grasset, 1951. 279 pp. Fr. 390.

Fénelon et le Tricentenaire de sa Naissance, 1651-1951. Nos. 12-14 du *XVII^e Siècle*. *Paris*: Société d'Etude du XVII^e siècle, 1952. 234 pp.

Fusero, Clemente.—Vita e poesia di Rimbaud. *Milan*: Ed. Dall' Oglia, 1951. 333 pp. L. 1000.

Gorsse, Pierre de.—Edmond Rostand. *Toulouse*: Douladoure, 1951. 30 pp.

Gouhier, M.-A.—Charles Du Bos. Préface de Fr. Mauriac. *Paris*: Vrin, 1951. 190 pp. Fr. 450.

Guille, F. V.—François-Victor Hugo et son œuvre. *Paris*: Nizet, 1951. 367 pp. Fr. 600.

Guyon, Bernard.—La Création littéraire chez Balzac, la genèse du "Médecin de campagne." *Paris*: Colin, 1951. xiv + 261 pp. Fr. 600.

Herriot, Edouard.—Jean Giraudoux. Avec une étude par Louis Joxe. *Paris*: la Passerelle, 1951. 59 pp. Fr. 1200.

Hugo.—Œuvres complètes, Les Travaux de la mer, éd. Michel Braspart. *Givors*: Martel, 1951. x + 621 pp. Fr. 2000.

— Contemplations. Livre 4^e, éd. G. Chapon. *Paris*: Larousse, 1950. 80 pp. Fr. 34.

— Feuilles d'automne, éd. J. Boudout. *Ibid.*, 1950. 80 pp. Fr. 34.

— Hernani, éd. P. Moreau. *Ibid.*, 1950. 160 pp. Fr. 34.

— Notre Dame de Paris, éd. L. Roinet. 2 v. *Ibid.*, 1949. Fr. 68.

— Odes et ballades, éd. R. Delbaisse. *Ibid.*, 1950. 96 pp. Fr. 34.

— Œuvres choisies, éd. Moreau et Boudout. 2 v. *Ibid.*, 1950. Fr. 1900.

Lancaster, H. C.—The Comédie Française 1701-1774. Plays, Actors, Spectators, Finances. *Philadelphia*: The American Philosophical Society, 1951. 257 pp., double cols. \$2.50. (*Transactions of the APS*, Vol. xii, Part 4.)

Le Sage, Laurence.—Metaphor in the Non-dramatic Works of Jean Giraudoux. *Eugene*: U. of Oregon Press, 1952. viii + 75 pp.

Peygnaud, Louis.—De la vallée de George Sand aux collines de Jean Giraudoux. *Paris*: Charles-Lavauzelle, 1951. 469 pp. Fr. 750.

Tild, Jean.—Théophile Gautier et ses amis. *Paris*: A. Michel, 1951. 288 pp. Fr. 570.

Wais, Kurt.—Mallarmé. Dichtung. Weisheit. Haltung. *Munich*: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1952. iv + 800 pp. DM. 45.

ITALIAN

Alfieri.—Antigone, ed. Guido Di Pino. *Florence*: La nuova Italia, 1951. xxii + 103 pp. L. 275.

Belvederi, Raffaele.—Giacomo Leopardi. *Rovigo*: Ipag, 1951. 326 pp. L. 800.

— Ugo Foscolo. *Rovigo*: Ipag, 1951. 225 pp. L. 600.

Borghi, Cappuccio, etc.—Vittorio Alfieri. Studi commemorativi in occasione del centenario della nascita. *Florence*: Ed. Universitarie, 1951. xiii + 197 pp. L. 1000.

Calabrese, Franco.—Incontri con Leopardi. *Milan*: Gastaldi, 1951. 125 pp. L. 400.

Cappuccio, Carmelo.—La Critica alfierrina. Orientamenti e prospettive. *Florence*: La Nuova Italia, 1951. viii + 224 pp.

Caraccio, Armand.—D'Annunzio drammaturgo. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1951. 223 pp. Fr. 500.

Chiappelli, Fredi.—Studi sul linguaggio del Machiavelli. *Florence*: Le Monnier, 1952. 136 pp.

Cordié, Carlo.—Due epigoni del simbolismo francese: Samain e Le Cardonnel. *Arona*: Ed. "Paideia," 1951. iv + 272 pp.

Devoto, Giacomo.—I fondamenti della storia linguistica. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1951. 96 pp. L. 600.

D'Orsi, Francesco.—Jacopone da Todi. *Agrigento*: Dima, 1951. 141 pp.

Gianezza, Elvira.—Manzoni poeta. *Bologna*: Cappelli, 1951. 91 pp.

Luchaire, Julien.—Boccaccio. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1951. 301 pp. Fr. 590.

MacClintock, Lander.—The Age of Pirandello. *Bloomington*: U. of Ind. Press, 1951. 341 pp. \$5.00.

Majer, Bruno.—Profilo della critica su Italo Svevo (1892-1951). *Trieste*: Ed. Univ. di Trieste, 1951. 112 pp.

Malagoli, L.—Linguaggio e poesia nei poeti del Duecento. *Pisa*: Libr. Goliardica, 1951. 226 pp. L. 1000.

Manaresi, Alfonso.—La primavera della letteratura d'Italia. *Bologna*: Ed. Poseidon, 1951. 262 pp.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Tutte le poesie, ed. A. Polvara. *Milan*: Rizzoli, 1951. 244 pp. L. 180.

Manzotti, Fernando.—Cataloghi delle lettere di Veronica Gamba. *Verona*: Ed. Nova historia, 1951. 32 pp.

Marcazzan, Mario.—Poesia e umanità nell'opera di A. Manzoni. *Venice*: La goliardica, 1951. iv + 195 pp.

Moretti, Alfredo.—Interpretazione di Machiavelli. *Spezia*: Ass. pedagogica ital., 1951. 52 pp.

Neri, Ferdinando.—Letteratura e leggende. *Turin*: Chiantore, 1951. xlviii + 355 pp.

Porta, Antonio.—La letteratura comparata nella storia e nella critica. *Milan*: Marzorati, 1951. 116 pp.

Russo, Luigi.—Ritratti e disegni storici. Serie terza. Studi sul Due e Trecento. *Bari*: Laterza, 1951. 546 pp. L. 2200.

Ruzzante.—La Pastorale, ed. Emilio Lovarini. *Florence*: La Nuova Italia, 1951. xxvi + 131 pp.

Waszink, J. H.—Bloesemtij der letteren. Het humanisme van Fr. Petrarca. *Arnhem*: Slaterus, 1951. 62 pp.

SPANISH

Arrando, María del Pilar.—Auzias March y Garcilaso de la Vega, poetas del dolorido amor. *Mexico*: 1948. 159 pp.

Beinhaner, Werner.—Das Tier in der spanischen Bildsprache. *Hamburg*: Heitmann, 1949. 135 pp.

Bousoño, Carlos.—La Poesía de Vicente Aleixandre. Prólogo de Dámaso Alonso. *Madrid*: Edic. Insula, 1950. xv + 280 pp.

Calcaño, Julio.—El castellano en Venezuela: Estudio crítico. *Caracas*: Ministerio de Ed. Nac., 1949. xxxix + 571 pp.

Calderón.—La Dama Duende, ed. Herbert Koch. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1952. 119 pp. RM. 3.50.

Castro, F. I.—Vocabulario y frases de "Martin Fierro." *Buenos Aires*: 1950. 468 pp.

Cuervo, R. J.—Disquisiciones sobre filología castellana, ed. R. Torres Quintero. *Bogotá*: Caro y Cuervo, 1950. 666 pp.

García López, José.—Historia de la Literatura Española. *Barcelona*: Edic. Teide. 263 pp.

Gavaldá, A. C.—Personajes del Quijote. *Barcelona*: Pubs. Cunillera, 1950. 205 pp.

Gayangos, Pascual de (ed.).—Libros de Caballerías. *Madrid*: Eds. Atlas, 1950. xcii + 580 pp. (BAE, XL).

Giese, W.—Geschichte der spanischen und portugiesischen Literatur. *Bonn*: Athenäum, 1949. 175 pp.

Granados de Bagnasco, J.—Lineamenti particolari della lingua e letteratura spagnola nei secoli xii e xiii. *Milan*: Malfasi, 1949.

Griera, A.—Dialectología catalana. *Barcelona*: C. S. I. C., 1949. 152 pp.

Hill, John M.—Voces germanescas. *Bloomington*: Indiana U., 1949. xi + 192 pp.

Hootkins, H.—Spanish through Reading. *Ann Arbor*: Wahr, 1950. \$4.50.

Juretschke, Hans.—Vida, Obra y Pensamiento de Alberto Lista. *Madrid*: Escuela de Historia moderna, 1951. xii + 718 pp.

Lira, Osvaldo.—Visión política de Quevedo. *Madrid*: Sem. de Problemas Hispanoamericanos, 1948. 286 pp.

Malmberg, Bertil.—Etudes sur la phonétique de l'espagnol parlé en Argentine. *Lund*: Gleerup, 1950. 290 pp.

Maregalli, F.—La letteratura spagnola nel secolo desimosesto. L'epoca di Carlo V. *Milan*: La Goliardica, 1949.

Montoro Sanchis, Antonio.—Poética española. *Barcelona*: Gili, 1949. 280 pp.

Oller, Juan.—Crisol del idioma castellano. *Buenos Aires*: 1950. 300 pp.

Pabón Núñez, L.—Quevedo, político de la oposición. *Bogotá*: Edit. Argra, 1949. 266 pp.

Pellegrini, G. B.—Grammatica storica spagnola. *Bari*: Ed. L. da Vinci, 1950. viii + 273 pp.

Rafols, J. F.—Modernismo y modernistas. *Barcelona*: Eds. Destino, 1949. 450 pp.

Rodríguez-Moñino, Antonio.—El Cancionero manuscrito de Pedro del Pozo (1547). *Madrid*: Aguirre, 1950. 144 pp.

Rubén Darío.—Antología poética, ed. A. Torres-Rioseco. *Berkeley*: U. of Cal. Press, 1949. xxxviii + 294 pp.

Saez, Antonia.—El teatro en Puerto Rico. *San Juan*: Univ. de P. R., 1950. 185 pp.

Scköel, Alonso (ed.).—Introd. a la poesía moderna. Antología y crítica de poetas castellanos del siglo XX. *Santander*: Sal Terrae, 1948. 320 pp.

Selva, Juan B.—Trascendencia de la gramática de Bello y estado actual de los estudios gramaticales. *Buenos Aires*: Kapelus, 1950. x + 245 pp.

Setien de Jesús María, E. G.—Las Raíces de la poesía Sanjuanista y Dámaso Alonso. *Burgos*: Edit. El Monte Carmelo, 1950. 397 pp.

Stinglhamber, Louis.—Dans le Jardin des Hespérides. Essais sur l'Espagne et sa litt. *Gembloux*: Duculot, n. d. 191 pp.

Tettenborn, P. D. (ed.).—Spanish Lyrics of the Golden Age. *London*: Bell, 1952. viii + 208 pp. 6/6.

Triadó, Joan (ed.).—Antología de Con-
tistes Catalans (1850-1950). *Barcelona*:
Edit. Selecta, 1950. lxiv + 1568 pp.

Vidal de Battini, B. E.—El habla rural de San Luis. *Buenos Aires*: Inst. de Filología, 1949. xx + 448 pp.

Webber, Ruth House.—Formulistic Dic-
tion in the Spanish Ballad. *Berkeley and
Los Angeles*: U. of Cal. Press, 1951. (U. of
Cal. Pubs., xxxiv, no. 2, pp. 175-278.)

PORTUGUESE

Barbosa, Rui.—Oração aos moços, ed. Carlos Enriques da Rocha Lima. *Rio de Janeiro*: Casa de Rui Barbosa, 1949. xix + 93 pp.

Correia Pacheco, A. (ed.).—Machado de Assis, romântico. *Washington*: Pan-
american Union, 1949. 78 pp.

Rocha, A. C.—Aspectos do Cancioneiro Geral. *Coimbra*: Coimbra Editora, 1949. 147 pp.

Said Ali, M.—Versificação portuguesa. *Rio de Janeiro*: Inst. Nac. do Livro, 1949. xii + 83 pp.

Silva, J. A. Capela e.—Ganharias. *Lisbon*: 1949. 304 pp.

RUSSIAN

Chekhov, Anton.—Selected Short Stories, ed. G. A. Birkett and Gleb Struve. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [N. Y.: Oxford U. Press], 1951. 235 pp. \$3.00.

Chernuchin, I.—English Russian Technical and Scientific Dictionary. *London*: G. Allen, 1951. 674 pp. 80s.

Corbet, Charles.—La Littérature russe. *Paris*: Colin, 1951. 223 pp. Fr. 260.

Lermontov, Turgenev.—Taman' ed. F. Marshak-Sobotka; *Three Short Stories and The Provincial Lady*, ed. R. A. Goodwin and G. V. Bobrinskoy. *Boston*: Heath, 1952. 48 + 182 pp. \$2.60.

Preobrazhenskii, A. G.—Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language. *New York*: Columbia U. Press, 1951.

Stilman, Leon.—Russian Verbs of Motion. *New York*: King's Crown Press, 1951. vi + 78 pp. \$1.25.

PERSIAN

Levy, Reuben.—The Persian Language. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1951. 125 pp. \$5.75.

GENERAL

Crane, Keast, McKeon, Maclean, Olson, Weinberg.—Critics and Criticism Ancient and Modern. Ed. with Introd. by R. S. Crane. *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1952. 649 pp. \$6.00.

Duckworth, George E.—The Nature of Roman Comedy. A Study in Popular Entertainment. *Princeton*: Princeton U. Press, 1952. xvi + 501 pp. \$7.50.

Lamont, Corliss (ed.).—Man Answers Death, an Anthology of Poetry. Second and enlarged ed. *New York*: Philosophical Library, 1952. xvi + 330 pp. \$4.50.

Parsons, E. A.—The Alexandrian Library. Glory of the Hellenic World. *New York*: The Elzevier Press, 1952. xvi + 468 pp. \$7.50.

Princeton

UNIVERSITY PRESS



MELVILLE'S QUARREL WITH GOD

By LAWRENCE THOMPSON. The author argues that Melville, seeking to disguise his agonized conviction of the cruelty and malice of God, consistently satirized Christian doctrine by resorting to literary deceptions that could simultaneously satirize and hoodwink his orthodox readers. This bold challenge to the conventional interpretation of Melville is brilliantly presented and fully supported by external and internal evidence in such a way as to reveal a sinister intent in all of the major narratives from *Typee* through *Billy Budd*.

475 pages, \$6.00

JANE AUSTEN

IRONY AS DEFENSE AND DISCOVERY

By MARVIN MUDRICK. Jane Austen emerges from behind the comfortable assumptions of a hundred years and takes her true place among the most stalwart of the great ironists. Through an analysis of all her writings and a study of her irony in its sources and development, the book achieves its twofold aim of reevaluating the novels and the growth of the novelist herself from the juvenilia through the great novels to *Sanditon*.

"The most acute and illuminating analysis of Jane Austen's novels with which I am acquainted." — *Joseph Warren Beach*.
"By far the best book on the subject to date." — *Mark Schorer*.

\$5.00

THE IMAGERY OF SOPHOCLES' "ANTIGONE"

By ROBERT F. GOHEEN. "By the delicate and sturdy use of the poetic criticism of our own time — by using the tools of our own sensibility — Mr. Goheen tackles the perpetual job of restoring to experience the life of a classic. His study of the imagery of the *Antigone* helps us to seize for ourselves what underlies both Sophocles' Greek and our English, the moving poetic power of language itself. His *Antigone* becomes part of our Sophocles." — *R. P. Blackmur*.

\$3.00

At your bookstore

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS

A new review grammar with training in
conversational and written Spanish



Guyer and Ugarte's
PLÁTICAS Y TEMAS
SOBRE LA AMÉRICA ESPAÑOLA

All lessons are in Spanish dialogue form, representing the conversation of a group of persons traveling in South America. Each dialogue is followed by oral exercises for conversation practice, special exercises on idioms, grammatical exercises, and *temas* for translation from English to Spanish. Handsomely illustrated.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY



Perfect Your FRENCH
... in this natural French setting at
McGILL UNIVERSITY
FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL
MONTREAL

JUNE 26 to AUGUST 8, 1932

BEFORE YOU VISIT EUROPE

Perfect your French, for professional use or for business or pleasure, in the natural, attractive French atmosphere of McGill's popular, long-established French Summer School at Montreal. Ideal study, conversational, residential course for teachers, students, and business people; also for advanced students of good intellectual ability who aim at graduate work in McGill. French alone spoken at all times in residence. Tuition is of unusually high standards by experienced French university teachers. Resident scholarships and university credit certificates. Co-educational. Luxurious accommodation in Royal Victoria College, interesting social amenities, music and dramatics.

Fees: \$285.00 (board, residence & tuition). Tuition only—
\$125.00 (Canadian Funds)

Write today for prospectus to: **DIRECTOR, FRENCH SUMMER SCHOOL**

McGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL, CANADA